

THE TIMES, LIFE AND THOUGHT
OF
PATRICK FORBES
BISHOP OF ABERDEEN. 1618-1635.

By
W. G. S. Snow M. A. (Hons).



CONTENTS

Introduction		i Page
Chapter 1	: The House of Corse.	1
"	11 : 1564-1598 Early Years and Associations.	13
"	111 : 1598-1618 Laird of Corse and Minister at Keith.	30
"	1V : Elevation to the See of Aberdeen.	68
"	V : Patrick Forbes and the Non-Conformists.	86
"	VI : Patrick Forbes and the Policy of Charles I.	110
"	VII : Patrick Forbes and the Diocese of Aberdeen.	133
"	VIII : Bishop Patrick Forbes and the Colleges of Aberdeen.	149
"	IX : The Thought of Bishop Patrick Forbes.	196
"	X : The Influence of Bishop Patrick Forbes and His Circle.	230
"	XI : Epitaph.	250
Appendices.		260
Bibliography.		287.

INTRODUCTION

With the passing years the men who shaped the past, whose influence was upon their kind, tend to become lost in the mists of time. The message of their lives is forgotten and since, in a real sense, "all history is contemporary history", the present generation is the poorer in experience and vision.

To-day powerful secular forces battle for the souls of men. Christendom faces them with a disunited front. There would appear to be but two alternatives to ultimate defeat: either there must be a re-union of Christendom- or even of Protestant Christendom - based upon uniformity, or a comprehensive church based on a federation of religious communities. It is in the hope of making some small contribution to either of these essential developments that I embarked upon the present study.

The burning issue is no longer that of the seventeenth century when Anglican and Non-Conformist convulsed the peoples with their rival claims in the bitter struggle to determine and define the national church. The real issue to-day is not sectarian at all. It is between churchmen of whatever denomination and agnostics of every variety and creed. Christians must set about the closure of their ranks before the final trial of strength.

This can only be achieved if churchmen to-day re-capture the vision of those rare spirits of the seventeenth century who travelled this earthly road as pilgrims, their eyes intent upon a heavenly goal. Patrick Forbes, saintly and tolerant/

tolerant, was one of these. Presbyterian accusations to the contrary have been handled with the severity they deserve. Forbes was without doubt the outstanding ecclesiastic of the First Scottish Episcopate and one of the greatest religious leaders of a century which produced a galaxy of notable churchmen. A landowner of the finest type, he was deeply interested in the many distressing problems which confronted the Protestant in his native county of Aberdeen. The son of a house which could boast a noble tradition of public service he was alive to the needs of the church as a national institution. A Christian of the most profound learning and breadth of mind he thought of the church not only as a series of local communities, not merely as a national establishment, but as *something* still ~~under a continuing communion~~ of Christians with a common aim and a common faith overriding local variations of polity.

Unity between the Presbyterian and Episcopalian churches which would greatly strengthen the defence of Christendom is, I am convinced, only possible, when their members make the well-reasoned views and the fine Christian Spirit of Patrick Forbes their own. A thorough understanding of Forbes's exposition of the Apostolic Succession, of the place of Presbytery and Episcopacy in Christian tradition, is an essential to any rapprochement between these two historic churches. This has been fully dealt with in Chapter LX. His thought was representative of an influential body of Christian opinion in both Scotland and England. In Scotland it continued to inspire a second and third/

third generation, only to be denied in practice because worldly motives prevailed and self-righteous sectarianism intervened.

The period 1560-1638 was probably the most formative in the political and religious history of Scotland. It commenced with the Reformation and concluded with a Revolution. During the intervening years, which Forbes's life almost spanned, rival conceptions of political sovereignty and of religious faith and polity struggled for the mastery. It was an age of twisted motives and tortuous policies in which the warp of pure religious conviction was shot through with the coarse woof of political interests and economic self-seeking to weave a tangled tapestry of events. Nevertheless there gradually emerged a definite design in the affairs of both church and state upon which the Scotland of the future took shape.

The Reformation raised a host of complex questions. What was to be the polity, what the assets of the new Kirk? Was it to be pseudo-Episcopal, Episcopal, ~~Episcopal~~-Presbyterial or Presbyterian? Who was to enjoy the properties of the old church, King, Kirk or Nobility? These and numerous ^{other} questions ~~raised~~ the larger question of political sovereignty. Was *lex rex*, or *rex lex*? This was, in fact the major issue of the period. James VI established Episcopacy and both he and his son Charles I, used it as the chief instrument of a royal Absolutism. In order to gain their economic and political ends the Scottish nobility became Presbyterians and Parliamentarians/

arians. In radical Calvinism, which formed the doctrinal background of Presbyterianism, the nobles found ready to hand a religion of opposition. Thus they challenged the royal prerogative in the religious sphere, and the imposition of a Prayer Book upon the Scottish Church in 1637 on the sole authority of the King was quickly followed by a Covenant the purport of which Drummond of Hawthornden saw clearly when he denounced it because "it giveth a law to a King ..."^{1.} With a man like Charles I. upon the throne it was impossible to avoid or even to delay the political issue. He set himself to govern both England and Scotland as an Absolute Monarch while his financial needs clashed with the financial interests of his subjects. But had the leaders of Episcopacy in Scotland possessed the religious tolerance and the political sagacity of Patrick Forbes, the struggle to settle the political issue might not have involved their downfall. Scotland might have had a single united Protestant Church with Bishop and Presbyteries working in close harmony. It was on behalf of such a church that Forbes worked and wrote.

There has only been one attempt to construct anything like a full account of the life of Patrick Forbes. This was by G.F. Shand in his introduction to the funeral orations and pieces offered in honour of the Bishop and published by the Spottiswoode Society in 1845.^{2.}

1. Napier M. Memorial of Montrose and His Time 1. p.78 (Maitland Club 1848-50)

2. The title of the publication was: The Funerals of a Right-
Revrend Father-in-God, Patrick Forbes of
Corse.

1845.² Shand's Memoir is valuable but enters into no detailed analysis of Forbes's thought, nor of the movements of the time which formed the background of his life and in which he played a notable part. The author is content to follow the brief references of Garden to the Bishops' work as Chancellor of Aberdeen University and does not attempt to assess the extent of his influence upon seventeenth century religious life and thought. Besides Shand did not have before him the printed editions of the Register of the Privy Council of Scotland which throw additional and interesting light upon Forbes as a statesman and a diocesan.

A recent valuable addition to a fuller understanding of the life and influence of Patrick Forbes is contained in Professor G.D. Henderson's 'Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland'. The most useful parts of Henderson's essay on Forbes are those which deal with his work in connection with King's College, Aberdeen and his influence throughout the remainder of the seventeenth century. Henderson helps us to fill in the gaps left by Shand and I gladly acknowledge my indebtedness to these two scholars.

Apart from the 'Funerals' the most useful source of information regarding the life and outlook of Forbes is to be found in George Garden's Latin edition of Doctor John Forbes's works which he published in 1703. Wodrow's account of the Bishop in his 'Biographical Collections' is little more than a translation of Garden. Throughout his long life Garden was intimately connected with Aberdeen and district and his vivid precis of the great Bishop's/

Bishop's life and work is undoubtedly authentic. Useful items of information about Forbes are contained in the Preface to Burnet's 'Life of William Bedell', Strachan's 'Panegyricus Inauguralis', the histories of Spalding, Gordon, Calderwood, Spottiswoode and in the Spalding Club's 'Selections from the Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen'. It is a matter of regret that the Aberdeen Synod and Presbytery records covering the years of Forbes's Episcopate are fragmentary and incomplete. As explained in the appropriate place Doctor John Forbes's 'Irenicum' may be taken as containing a full expression of the Bishop's own views and cannot therefore be neglected in any study of his life.

It has been said that when God appoints a man to some special work or witness His preparatory action is to be seen in the circumstances of hereditary descent. Forbes's ancestry has been fully explored in Chapter 1 with such comment as appeared necessary and his ^{degree of} kinship with Andrew Melville, usually **left vague**, indicated. From time to time suggestions which seemed historically reasonable have been offered and erroneous or misleading statements challenged. Material not previously used by those who have written of Patrick Forbes, ~~and~~ from the Registers of the Privy Council of Scotland and from the Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen, has been used, while the closest attention has been given to Forbes's own writings.

It has not been easy to keep Forbes continually in the picture, but I have tried, chiefly by use of Appendices, to avoid Russell Lowell's criticism of Masson's Life of **Milton** - that **Milton/**

Milton was sometimes only an incident in his own biography. Opportunity has been taken to explain the principles governing Episcopal Elections during the First Scottish Episcopate and to elucidate other points frequently omitted or glossed over in text books. Particularly have I tried to stress the decisive nature of the economic and political motives which underlay the National Covenant of 1638, for these have not been correctly gauged by Episcopalian historians who have too frequently tended to represent the issue as a clear-cut one between Episcopacy and Presbyterianism.

For the sake of convenience I have modernised spelling wherever old quotations have been used but have left place-names in their seventeenth century form to facilitate reference.

Chapter 1.The House of Corse.

The founder of the House of Corse in the parish of Coul, Aberdeenshire, was Patrick the third son of James, second Lord Forbes who had married Egidia, the second daughter of William Keith, first Earl Marischal. This Patrick Forbes was armour-bearer to King James III. who, as a reward for faithful service, granted him ^{in 1482} the extensive lands of O'Neil.¹ He was succeeded by his son David "filius naturalis Patricii dicti",² who was also described as "a gallant and brave man".³ Some historians have surmised from the use of the term 'naturalis' that this David, the second of Corse, was an illegitimate child and that therefore the noble House of Corse and Craigievar had in it the bend sinister. But the word 'naturalis' taken by itself did not at this time contain any such meaning. 'Naturalis' was opposed to adopted son - it is not 'bastardus' in the early sixteenth century. This becomes apparent when we scrutinize the deeds legitimatising the children of priests where the terms in common employment were 'bastardus' or 'filius carnalis'. It was later⁴ that the word 'naturalis' came to denote the baser antecedent.

1. R.M.S. ii No.1518: Certaine Records p.xxxlil: McFarlane: Genealogical Collections 2p258: The House of Forbes p315: Balfour Paul: The Scots Peerage 4.p51.
2. R.M.S. ib No.3530.
3. Certaine Records pxxxlii
4. The ~~Thana~~ge of ~~Per~~martyn p664.

David Forbes married Elizabeth Painter - McFarlane and others are wrong in giving the lady's name as Margaret⁵ - whose brother Patrick Painter, the Master of the hospital of St. Mary near Montrose and Abbot of Cambuskenneth was Secretary to King James IV⁶ and James V. Their son Patrick married Marjorie, a daughter of Robert Lumsden of Cushnie, and they had a large family of whom we have the following record.⁷

1. William the heir and fourth of Corse
2. Patrick of Bithnie, who married Elizabeth the daughter of Duncan Forbes of Cults. They had an elder son Duncan and a younger son, William of Tilligreig who became minister of Mortlach.
3. Arthur who saw service in the Swedish army, lived for a while at Middelburg and had a daughter who married William Forbes, minister at Fraserburgh in 1618.

There were five daughters of the Forbes - Lumsden union who married respectively: Garioch of Kinstair; Irvine of Beltie; Walter Curror of Inchdrewer; Walter Barclay of Drumdelgie; the youngest Elizabeth who married William Leith of Whitehaugh.

William inherited from his father in 1568. Garden described him as "vir sagax et magnanimus"⁸ and we are told that he was one of the first in Scotland to embrace the reformed doctrines.⁹

5. R.M.S. ib. No. 3530: McFarlane: op cit 2.p481: Lumsden: Geneology of the House of Forbes p20.
6. R.M.S. ib No.3765: Balfour Paul: op cit 7.p287-8(n): McFarlane :ib: The House of Forbes: ib.In early times the family of Painter had produced some eminent ecclesiastics and Patrick is very well known for his Latin diplomatic correspondence as Secretary.⁷
7. The House of Forbes p315-6: Thanage of Fermatyn p665:
8. Garden: 51
9. Certaine Records pxxxiii: McFarlane :ib.

It was during William's ~~t~~enancy that the old Corse castle was plundered and partially destroyed by highland freebooters - a not uncommon occurrence in the north of Scotland in those days. 10

The Laird of Corse resolved that such should not happen again and rebuilt the family seat on more substantial lines in 1581. 11

William Forbes had married Elizabeth, a daughter of Alexander Strachan of Thornton in Kincardineshire who came of an ancient and influential line with a record of public service. 12 They

had a large family of seven sons and at least five ~~daughters~~ 13 daughters regarding whom we may note the following brief facts:

1. Patrick the eldest child born at Corse castle on 24th August 1564 who is the subject of this study.

2. William known as "Merchant Willie" of Craigievar, of whom fuller mention will be made in due course.

3. John, who was for a while minister at Alford in the Diocese of Aberdeen. He was the Author of 'Certaine Records', a useful contemporary account of the points at issue between the King and the ultra -Presbyterians during the first years of the seventeenth century and was banished the realm in 1606 for attending the unlawful General Assembly at Aberdeen the previous year in open defiance of the royal authority. 14 He retired to the

Continent/

10. Funerals pxxv(n) R.P.C(ist series) 5 pxlvi - ix etc.

11. Funerals **ib**.

12. R.M.S. v No.2353:viNo.337,339: Certaine Records:ib:McFarlane op.cit. 2.p270: Funerals pxxvii(n)

13. The House of Forbes p316-7: Thanage of Fermartyn p665: Certaine Records pxxxiii-iv: Lumsden: op cit p21: McFarlane:ib p481.

14. cf Chapter lll.

Continent where he founded and served a Presbyterian congregation at Middelburg.¹⁵ John Forbes of Alford, as he is best

known had three sons, the youngest of whom, Patrick, became Bishop of Caithness after the Restoration, but he does not appear to have possessed the great ability and piety of the uncle after whom he was named.¹⁶

4. Alexander who became a Captain in the army and who died without issue.

5. James of Knockandoch who married a Mary Balfour, by whom he had six sons and one daughter, of whose issue there is no record save of one son, Robert.

6. Arthur who pursued a military career, distinguishing himself in the service of the King of Sweden and finally settling down in Ireland. He was created a baronet by Charles I. in 1628 and his son received an Irish peerage - that of Granard - from King Charles II. in 1670, whence the Earls of Granard.

7. Robert of whom nothing is known.

The daughters of the house appear to have been properly provided for and to have made favourable marriages.

1. Margaret, who in her virginity was invested in the lands of Kinnellar,¹⁷ married Henry Forbes of Thanston.

2. Agnes who married Robert Forbes, Prior of Monymusk and who while/

(Editors Introduction)

15. Certain Records p. xxxv-xlii: McCrie: Life of Melville 2. p448, 432

16. Certain Records pliii-iv quotation from Wodrow: Keith: Catalogue of Scottish Bishops. p. 218.

17. R.M.S. V. No. 1258.

while unmarried had been invested in the lands of Tullyriach.

3. The third daughter, whose name is unknown, married John Farquhar of Norham.

4. Elizabeth who married Duncan Forbes of Camphill.

5. Mary who married Alexander Ogilvie of Milndavie.

Of the remaining two sisters of Patrick Forbes there is no record and they may not have survived childhood.

It will thus be evident that Patrick Forbes was well and widely connected and that he was closely linked with the other branches of the powerful Forbes family. Through his ancestor James, second Lord Forbes, he could claim affinity with the direct Forbes line; through Duncan the brother of Patrick, the Founder of the House of Corse, with the Forbes of Corsindae, Monymusk, and Leslie; through his uncle Patrick with the Forbes of Bithnie and Cultra; while on his maternal side he could claim kinship with such well-known families as the Lumsdens, the Painters and the Strachans.

The lands of Corse originally formed part of the Barony of Coul and O'Neil which in the thirteenth century were held of the Crown by the family of Durward. In 1389 this barony was resigned by Isabella, Countess of Fife and bestowed by Robert II on his son, the Duke of Albany. Albany died in 1420 and with the return of James I from exile in England in 1424, the House of Albany rebelled and was forfeit, the barony automatically reverting to the Crown.

18. The House of Forbes p316.

19. The precise relationships of the various Forbes's can be readily studied in the Third Spalding Club's recent valuable publication 'The House of Forbes' (1937) already mentioned in the list of references. (12 p1108)

20. Rait: The Making of Scotland p112-3. New Statistical Account

There it remained until 1482 when James III bestowed upon his armour-bearer Patrick Forbes, and his successors "the lands of the Barony of O'Neil, namely, of Coul, Kincragy and Corse".²¹ David Forbes, Patrick's eldest son and heir, retained the lands of Corse and Kincragy²² and together with his wife Elizabeth Painter, received from King James IV in 1510 a charter of "the lands of O'Neil, Corse, Kincragy, le Mureton with the mill and alehouse", who "as a special favour incorporated them into a free barony to be called the Barony of O'Neil".²³ Apart from the usual royal and ecclesiastical dues the lands were burdened only with the additional obligations, comparatively trivial, of rendering the second tithes to the Bishops of Aberdeen.²⁴

The lands of Corse, Kincragy and O'Neil passed from father to son in heritable feu-farm of the Crown throughout the sixteenth century and were so held by William Forbes who was enfeoffed in 1568.²⁵ In 1594 his son Patrick acquired the lands of Kirton de Kinkell, while William Forbes had already secured tenure of the lands of Wester Corse and Norham²⁶ which had previously been in possession of the Pantons and Fraser of Stainwood whence they had passed to the **Urries** of Pitfitchie.²⁷ Thus when his father died in/

21. RMS ii No.1518: Balfour Paul: op cit 4. p51.

22. Exchequer Rolls 12 p501-2

23 RMS i b. No.3530.

24 Exchequer Rolls 1. p dxxv: 11 p243 cf Dowden: The Mediaeval Church in Scotland p166, 175-7.

25. Exchequer Rolls 13 p275, 415-6:15 p29:17 p30,85,201,427:22 p22, 109etc. Thanage of Fermartyn p 665-6.

26. RMS vi No.128: The House of Forbes p317.

27. Exchequer Rolls 16 p615: RMS ii No.3082: iii No.1040, 3253.

in 1598, Patrick Forbes was served heir in the lands of Corse, Kincragy, Mureton with the mill united in one Barony of O'Neil held in heritable feu-farm of the Crown,²⁸ while he also held the church lands of Kinkell and the lands of Wester Corse and Norham - a substantial holding out of which his mother was provided for by a life-rent interest in the lands of the manor place of Corse and the lands of Kincragy.²⁹

Patrick Forbes now took up his abode at the family seat (he had already interested himself in the estate)³⁰ where we are told he set about improving the family property.³¹ He would appear to have been a careful and able administrator of the Corse estates and was described as a "considerable" man.³² In 1622 four years after he became Bishop of Aberdeen he secured a charter under the Great Seal which stated that his ancestors had held in free barony and went on to erect all the lands in his possession into the free Barony of O'Neil.³³ We are informed that from the time when he became Bishop he did not "better his paternal estate nor add one furr of land to it".³⁴ It stood in 1635 when his eldest surviving son, Doctor John Forbes, inherited from him as it stood in 1618, with the exception that Wester Corse and Norham were now included with/

28. Thanage of Fermartyn p666: Exchequer Rolls 23 p297,348.

29. Exchequer Rolls 23 p416: Garden 84

30. Exchequer Rolls 21 p340: 22 p51,137,361.

31. Garden 84.

32. Wodrow: Biographical Collections p87.

33. RMS viii No.269.

34. Garden 89 p3: Wodrow: op.cit p98.

with the lands of Corse, Kincragy and Mureton: its mill and ale-house, in the free Barony of O'Neil.³⁵ We may dismiss as merely ~~as~~ scurrilous the assertion of contemporary Presbyterian historians that Forbes accepted his Bishopric in order to repair his broken lairdship,³⁶ though had there been any truth in the statement it is most unlikely that Wodrow who was no friend of Bishops would have let it pass.³⁷ Only the gravest mismanagement or neglect could have brought such an estate to the brink of ruin³⁸ at a time when land values were on the rise.

The house of Corse gave birth to the notable House of Craigievar which has continued to the present day. The Founder of the House of Craigievar was William Forbes the younger brother of Bishop Patrick Forbes. A most successful merchant William acquired large tracts of land to which in 1610 he added the lands of the Barony of Craigievar.³⁹ Amongst the numerous other estates which came into his possession were those of Caintradlane and Beidlestone in the parishes of Kinnellar and Dyce.⁴⁰ William whose/

35. Inquisitionum ad Capellam Domini Regis Retornatarum (1811) 1. No. 228.

36. Scot: Apologetical Narration P254: Calderwood: 7 P296: Row p 260.

37. Wodrow: op. cit p88.

38. cf A.F. 6. 1 p30: 4 pl42: 'The Valuation Roll of the County of Aberdeen for 1667' shows that the lands of the Laird of Corse in the parish of Coull were valued for rental purposes at £432-4-6 - a good average valuation for the shire and we have to remember that in 1656 George Forbes had disposed of certain lands held by his grandfather, the Bishop of Aberdeen cf pl4, 53.

39. RMS vii No. 246.

40. The Thanage of Fermartyn p667

whose relations with his brother Patrick appear to have been close and cordial, was obviously a landowner of the finest type and was one of the most affluent and influential men in the north.^{41.}

The kinship of Patrick Forbes of Corse with two entirely different, yet equally illustrious divines of his age ought to be noted. The association of the young Patrick with Andrew Melville is well-known and will be fully treated in the following chapter. What is not so well-known is that the future Bishop of Aberdeen and the great Presbyterian leader were actually second cousins.⁴² The other eminent divine with whom Patrick Forbes could claim a degree of relationship was William Forbes who was born at Aberdeen in 1585 and who became the first Bishop of Edinburgh in 1634.⁴³

In 1589 Patrick Forbes married Lucretia Spens, daughter of the Laird of Wormiston in Fife⁴⁴ whose family - an ancient one - would appear to have been comfortably placed.⁴⁵ They had three children - all sons:

1. William who predeceased his father without issue.⁴⁶
2. John who inherited in 1635.
- 3./

41. cf Appendix 1.

42. In Doctor John Forbes's Latin version of his father's works (p276n) published at Amsterdam in 1646 he preserves a letter dated 1614 from Andrew Melville to himself in which the now exiled reformer mentions the relationship which existed between them: "Unde et tu etiam per proavum tuum avunculum meum Patricium Forbesium genus paternum ducis" - you take your decent through your great-grandfather, Patrick Forbes, who is also my mother's brother. Thus William Forbes, The Bishop's father and Andrew Melville were first cousins. cf Funerals pxxxii (n).

43. cf Appendix 11. (No.128)

44. Melville: Diary p240: Garden § 4: McFarlane: opcit 2 p259. RMS.vi

45. RMS.vi No.338, 1863, 1981f: Exchequer Rolls: 15 p79, 185: Balfour Paul op cit 5 p399.

46. Certain Records pxxxiii-iv.

3. Robert who had no sons to carry on the Corse line and ⁴⁷ of whom we know next to nothing.

After his illustrious father, John Forbes is the most notable son of the House of Corse. He studied with much success at Aberdeen, Heidelberg, Sedan and other Continental Universities becoming a proficient scholar in Greek and Hebrew. In 1619 he was ^{—which is not absolutely certain—} ~~licensed or ordained~~ ^a to serve [^] in the church at Middelburg where his uncle, John Forbes of Alford was then minister. This same year he returned to Scotland and was shortly appointed to the newly instituted Professorship of Divinity — at King's College, Aberdeen, ⁴⁸ a post which he filled with distinction. Amongst the ~~several~~ weighty and learned works which flowed from his pen to gain for him a European reputation was the 'Irenicum' published in 1629 with a view to bringing peace to a church grievously vexed with ritualistic, ministerial and Eucharistic ⁴⁹ controversy. Doctor Forbes was the leading member of that eminent band of divines known as 'The Aberdeen Doctors', who so successfully disputed their principles with the Covenanters by whom he was eventually ⁵⁰ deposed. He was a man of ~~the~~ rare Christian spirit who had a horror of dwelling with sin, a man of ~~the~~ greatest intellectual breadth and of undoubted erudition, yet a man who humbled himself under the mighty hand/

47. The House of Forbes p 319.

48. Garden p19. Burnet: op cit Preface. Irving: Scottish Writers

2. p46 - 7: For the question of John Forbes's ordination of article in Scottish Notes & Queries (March 1932) by Professor

49. Garden p363 cf Chapter V.

50. cf Appendix 111.

E.D. Henderson

hand of God; a man of childlike simplicity, long suffering, utterly unworlaly and saintly, who found his main source of inspiration in the Holy Communion which he loved to attend. Everything we know of Doctor John Forbes justifies the lament of Spalding at his passing from amongst the learned society of Aberdeen: "Surely this was an excellent righteous man who feared God, was charitable to the poor and a singular scholar"⁵¹. But perhaps the highest testimony that can be found for him is that many of the Covenanters felt him to be the greatest among them for learning, piety, and character.⁵²

Doctor John Forbes married a Dutch lady from Middelburg by name of Soete Roosboom - Sweet Rosetree - who predeceased him in 1640. They had nine children, only one of whom, a son, survived his father. Doctor John would seem to have taken unto himself a second wife, a Janet Turing, who in 1654 appears as "Dowager of Corse"⁵³ but of this union there are no details. The surviving son Garden described as "praedictorum haud vero eruditionis et virtutum haeres" - the heir of his father's property but not of his learning and virtues.⁵⁴ He was named George and married a daughter of Kennedy of Kermuck, an ancient family, now extinct, in which the Constablership of Aberdeen was hereditary. With them/

51. Spalding: Memorials of the Troubles 2 p290.

52. Baillie: Letters and Journals. 1 p 248

53. The House of Forbes p317.

54. Garden 3 110 p70.

them the male line of the House of Corse comes to an end and the representation of this branch of the Forbes family devolves upon the House of Craigievar.⁵⁵ In 1656 George Forbes sold that part of the Barony of O'Neil, lying in Lumphanan, consisting of Easter and Wester Kincragy and its pendicles, to Duguid of Auchinhove, and the remainder of the Corse estates in 1670 he sold to his second cousin Sir John Forbes of Craigievar to which property it has continued to be united,⁵⁶ the present family of Corse being a cadet of Craigievar.

55. The House of Forbes p319: The Valuation Roll of the County of Aberdeen for 1667 p53 Lumsden: *op cit* p22 *cf* Appendix IV.
 56. The House of Forbes p318: The Valuation Roll of the County of Aberdeen for 1667. 16: New Statistical Account 12. p1109 *cf* Appendix IV.

Chapter 11.1564-1598: Early Years and Associations.

Patrick Forbes¹ was sent for the earlier part of his education to Stirling Grammar School where he probably arrived in the session 1572-73 when he was eight years old. Stirling was fortunate in that it could boast a long-established grammar school and legacies² which enabled the Town Council to secure an efficient headmaster. In 1571 the Council secured a really outstanding man for the post - Thomas Buchanan, nephew of the famous George Buchanan, a scholar of the highest worth,³ who had previously held a similar post at Edinburgh High School.⁴ While at Stirling Buchanan was placed at the very head of his profession⁵ and as one of "the most learned schoolmasters"⁶ was called upon to advise the Privy Council on educational matters and to assist his uncle in tutoring the young King James VI then resident at the Castle.⁷ As the place of the King's residence, Stirling was frequently the meeting place of the Privy Council and it became the ambition of many of the nobility and gentry to place their sons with Thomas Buchanan at the Grammar School. This ambition was evidently shared by William Forbes of Corse who, as one of the first in Scotland to accept the reformed doctrines,⁸ would be especially anxious to have his son and heir carefully instructed.

At/

1. Garden § 3 p.1: Wodrow: op. cit p82.
2. Huchieson: A History of the High School of Stirling p 3f, 18.
3. Melville: Diary p48, 122.
4. Steven: History of the High School of Edinburgh p12.
5. R.P.C. (1st series) 2 p478.
6. ib 3 p92-3.
7. Huchieson: op cit p31.
8. Certaine Records pxxxiii

At Stirling the young Patrick would learn the value of hard work and stern discipline, and would receive a good grounding in the fundamentals of the reformed faith. The day began with prayer at 6 a.m. and ended in like manner at 6 p.m. with only two one hour intervals, afternoon lessons extending from one o' clock to the close of school. The subjects taught - Scots, writing, Latin, Greek and Accounts - were arranged to cover a period of five years and promotion was solely on merit and not according to age. The school rules, written in great letters on a board where all could see them, forbade lateness, truancy, idleness, insubordination, gambling, and kindred evils and when necessary were enforced by the application of birch rods and the tawse.⁹ Nor on Sundays were the pupils allowed any respite, for the day was set apart for doctrinal teaching, catechism and examination on the sermon after the approved manner¹⁰ of the First Book of Discipline.

When the time came for Forbes to leave the Grammar School his father thought he could not do better than place him with their relative Andrew Melville.¹¹ A brilliant theologian of the strictest school of Calvin who had attained a fine reputation for scholarship abroad, Melville had become Principal of Glasgow College in 1574 where he set himself to further the educational schemes outlined in the Book of Discipline.¹² These schemes had been rendered impracticable/¹³

9. Huchieson: op cit p20-2.

10. 1b p22-3 cf Knox 2 p210, 212.

11Garden 3 3 p1: Wodrow: op cit p82

12. Melville: Diary p48.

13. Knox 2 p213f.

impracticable through the inability of the kirk to secure the temporalities of the old church which it had earmarked for educational purposes. Meanwhile the universities remained in a state of disorder and decay while the standard of teaching was deplorably low.¹⁴ Melville delegated to the others the work of management and concentrated upon teaching. He aimed to establish a sound standard of theological learning in the interests of the Reformation and to improve the standard learning generally with a view to making it unnecessary for students to seek higher education abroad where they would be susceptible to Jesuit influence. For the Arts course he instructed his pupils in Greek Grammar, Dialectic and Rhetoric with practice in Greek and Latin, proceeding to Mathematics and Geometry thence to Moral Philosophy based on the writings of Cicero, Plato, and Aristotle concluding the course with Natural Philosophy, Chronology and the Art of Writing. For the Divinity course the Principal gave his pupils a thorough grounding in Hebrew Grammar, Chaldee and Syriac, while delivering lectures based on Calvin's Institutes and concentrating all the while upon the Scriptures as the text-book of the course.¹⁵

Although/

14. Melville: *op cit* p30,36: Rashdall: The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages (1936): Morgan: The Rise and Progress of Scottish Education p52.^{2 p309-310.}

For the carrying out of its scheme of education the kirk was forced to rely upon the Act of Council of February 1562 and await the conveyance of obsolete endowments previously payable to the old religious establishments by the burghs, promised now for "hospitals, schools and other godly uses" - a promise slow to be implemented. It was this Act however, which in 1572 allowed the Provost and Magistrates of Glasgow to convey a gift for the maintenance of a Principal who was to be an exponent in Theology - two regents in Arts and twelve poor students. cf. RPC (1st series) 1. p497: History of the Universities of Edinburgh 1883-1933 Chapter 1 p6 by Professor R.K. Hannay. *Munimenta Almae Universitatis Glasguensis* 1.p84-85 2 p309-310.

Although the Arts curriculum remained mediaeval in character there was one noteworthy respect in which Melville sought to improve teaching. The pre-Reformation mode of instruction was ¹⁶for the regent to take his class through the complete course. It had been the intention of those who framed The Book of Discipline to change this ¹⁷and while compelled through a lack of regents to adopt the old method at first, Melville sought to secure promising students who could act as regents in each of the chief departments of the curriculum, thus making possible some degree of specialisation in the interests of ¹⁸efficiency. The New Foundation which he secured for the University in 1577 attempted to induce specialisation upon the regents But un-¹⁹fortunately it was not in the end successful.

Within two years of his appointment as Principal, Melville was ²⁰attracting students from all over Scotland to the University and Patrick Forbes was fortunate in having as his teachers, first the foremost schoolmaster and second the outstanding Principal and theologian of the generation. The lad had not been at Glasgow very long before Melville left for St. Andrews. There the teaching was very ²¹unsatisfactory and all three colleges were ruled by the Arts Faculty. Theology and legal studies were beyond the competence of the Dean and Faculty of Arts and amid the disunion brought about by the College system/

16. Rashdall *op cit* 2 p308-9.

17. Knox 2 p213f.

18. Melville *ib.*

19. Rashdall *op cit* 2 p318: Morgan: *op cit* p128.

20. Melville: *op cit* p49, 50.

21. RPC(1st series) 2 p542-3.

system some reform was essential. This state of affairs goes far to explain the scheme in the First Book of Discipline which was based on the idea of annexing a faculty to each college²³ - a scheme carried out in the case of St. Mary's College only. In 1579 the General Assembly anxious to keep students away from Paris and other Romanist centres, invited action by the government.²⁴ The New Foundation which resulted was largely the work of Andrew Melville²⁵ and by it St Mary's was permanently appropriated to the study^{of theology and each teacher had assigned to him his own particular department} of theological science,²⁶ the modern professorial system whereby a teacher restricted himself to a single subject being a much later development.²⁷ The Divinity Course was to be on the lines of that instituted by Melville at Glasgow²⁸ and he himself at the urgent request of the Assembly undertook the task of carrying out the New Foundation in so far as it applied to St. Mary's.²⁹

Andrew Melville entered upon his task as Principal of St. Mary's in 1580. He was accompanied from Glasgow by Patrick Forbes who was in the midst of his studies,³⁰ and by his own nephew James Melville author of the famous 'Diary', who was to teach Oriental languages in St. Mary's.³¹ The new Principal found little regard for theology amongst the regents and students but in a very short time, though not without/

22. *Votiva Tabella* p60: Rashdall *op cit* p308-310.

23. Knox 2 p213.

24. Calderwood 3 p446.

25. Melville: *op cit* p65, 75.

26. Evidence of Commissioners for Universities 3 p184, 398.

27. *ib* p335: 4 ii p288: Rashdall *op cit* 2 p321. (es 3 p184)

28. Melville: *op cit* p49: Evidence of Commissioners for the University

29. McCrie: The Life of Andrew Melville 1 p208-9.

30. Garden 4 p1.

31. McCrie: *op cit* 1 p252.

without considerable opposition, succeeded in inducing a change of outlook. He set himself to make those under him both philosophers and theologians. He read Aristotle, Xenophon and other authors in Greek, but the Bible, as at Glasgow, became the Divinity text-book and the measure of specialisation which he was able to introduce made for sound theological teaching and learning.³² It is important to bear in mind the university experience of Patrick Forbes under Melville's guidance when we come to study his work in connection with Aberdeen University. Unfortunately the good work which Melville began at St. Andrews was interrupted by ecclesiastical controversies in which he was opposed to James VI, a King who in other circumstances might have been his educational ally.

The controversy between Melville and the King had its origin in the inability of the kirk to secure a settled polity. The purely ecclesiastical heads of the Book of Discipline³³ could pass but its treatment of the property question was not practical politics.³⁴ The/

32. Melville: op cit pl24: Votiva Tabella pl18.

33. Knox 2 pl85ff

The First Book of Discipline stressed the supreme authority of the Scriptures, abolished Saints Days, restricted the sacraments to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which was regarded as a simple commemoration to be received sitting after Christ's example, declared the lawful means of making a minister to be election examination and admission. Superintendents were to inspect the dioceses, performing these offices which had normally fallen to the Bishop, while to make good the shortage of clergy, lay readers were to be temporarily employed. In the larger towns a weekly exercise compulsory for all ministers and readers within a radius of six miles was to be open to local office-bearers civil and ecclesiastical, while in every congregation elders were to be elected to assist the minister and deacons to administer the rents and alms. Many of these enactments formed the basis of future controversy but they were not in the meantime controversial.

34. ib pl28,297-8.

The Book tacitly regarded the monastic estates as secularised but claimed for the kirk the **teinds** and remaining temporalities. To extricate the **teinds**, distinguish these from land rents, as it had recommended, and restore them to a simple produce **teind** payable by the parochial landowner into a common fund for the upkeep of the ministry and the poor would be a long task and in the years following the Reformation it proved to be an impossible one. There would have to be compensation for bona fide transactions,³⁵ while any attempt to wrest from the landed gentry the ecclesiastical patrimony which had fallen promiscuously into their hands would be certain to result in contention. Besides, the Crown was impoverished and some measure of confiscation was necessary: one third was to be deducted from the income of all beneficed persons - including the prelates of the old Order - out of which the treasury would be relieved and the ministers receive assigned allowances, the remaining two thirds being retained in life-rent.³⁶ In the matter of the thirds the Crown did not keep its bargain with the kirk and the clergy were left to send the Comptroller to "the muckle devil".³⁷ Repeated pleas by the Assembly for the teinds and the arrears of thirds³⁸ were not entertained and in 1566 ministers had been a whole year without stipend.³⁹ The following year with the declaration of the true kirk, and the imposition of the Protestant oath,⁴⁰ the kirk looked for better treatment but the most that Moray could procure for it was the provisional collection of the thirds on condition that a portion was paid to the exchequer.⁴¹

There/

35. 1b p223

36. RBC (1st series) 1 pl92-4:201-3: Knox 2 p300,310: Birnie: A Short History of the Scottish **Teinds** p34.

37. Knox 2 p299

38. BUK p48,53,59-60,70. 41. BUK pl07-110: AP 3 p24,31

39. RPC.(1st series) 1 p487,494: Gladerwood 2 p329.

There remained the episcopal benefices held by the old Bishops in life-rent. What was to happen to them? The issue was raised in 1571 with the execution of Archbishop Hamilton of St. Andrews. The kirk had employed superintendents for duties equally consistent with the office of a Bishop⁴² and Morton suggested the re-introduction of the titles of Archbishop and Bishop on the plea that ~~th~~⁴³is would allow the kirk to secure the revenue of the Sees. The kirk took up the scheme and the Concordat of Leith in 1572 outlined a compromise which became the basis of controversy between Crown and Kirk. The Sees were to be occupied by clerics who should be subject to the review of the Assembly in spiritual things, but the specified forms of election to the Bishoprics merely gave the Chapter a formal voice in pronouncing the Crown nominee qualified⁴³ and the vicious system of Tulchan Bishops developed leaving the kirk in desperate straits.⁴⁴ It was impossible to offer adequate stipend and in 1574 there were only 289 ministers undertaking with the cheap assistance of 715 readers the cure of about 1000 parishes.⁴⁵ This state of affairs raised the whole question of the authority and polity of the kirk and under the presiding genius of Andrew Melville the Assembly matured the Second Book of Discipline which it produced in 1578.⁴⁶ It required the abolition of Papistical titles and stressed the principle of ministerial parity, contained the suggestion of more local assemblies - Presbyteries⁴⁷ - as an alternative form of government, and claimed for the kirk the power of the keys - the right to censure and dictate to civil office-bearers.

The/

42. McGregor: The Scottish Presbyterian Polity p77, 42-5, 47.

43. BUK p207-236: Calderwood 3 p181.

44. BUK p270, 310-1, 314-5: Melville op cit p31.

45. History of the University of Edinburgh 1883-1933 Chapter 1 p7
cf RPC (1st series) 2 p227-8: Birnie op cit p36.

46. BUK p 481f

The arrival out of France in 1579 of Esmé Stuart, a representative of the distinguished French family of D'Aubigny akin to the Scottish House of Lennox and an ardent Roman Catholic, was the occasion of a trial of strength between the theocratic kirk of Melville and the state in the person of King James. Lennox captured the affections of the young King and rapidly became the power about the throne. Though he professed conversion to Protestantism he was not believed and in a vain attempt to allay suspicion the court produced the King's Confession(1580-1) denouncing all things Papistical while maintaining a discreet vagueness on the polity of the Kirk.⁴⁸ The appointment of Montgomery to the See of Glasgow by Lennox for the benefit of his own pocket was discreditable⁴⁹ and the kirk was offended that James should give the Duke the vacant Abbacy of Arb~~ro~~ath 'in commendam' for which it had made strenuous suit.⁵⁰ The Lennox administration was stringent and costly,⁵¹ Elizabeth of England was sufficiently alive to the situation at her "postern gate" to intervene and the Raid of Ruthven in the summer of 1582 served to detach the King from the influence of his favourite. Melville had been party to the venture,⁵² the Assembly expressed its approval⁵³ and/

48 Spottiswoode 2 p268.

49. RPC (1st series) 3 p 490,496: Spottiswoode 2 p 382-3.

50. RPC (1st series) 3 pxxxii, 176-7.

51. lb p360,390,384,392, 477-8.

52. Calderwood 4 p3-12: Melville : op cit p170.

53. BUK p 594-6.

and the clergy began to press the principles of the Second Book of Discipline.⁵⁴ The reign of the Ruthven Lords was, however, brief

for in June 1583 James made good his escape and Melville found himself before the Privy Council for seditious preaching. He contemptuously declined its jurisdiction claiming that its members had no right "to judge and control the ambassadors and messengers of a King and Council greater nor they and far above them".⁵⁵ The Council ordered Melville to be confined to Blackness Castle, but feigning obedience he slipped after the Ruthven Lords into England.⁵⁶

Parliament met in May and proceeded to legislate against the Melvillian theocracy. King and Council were to be recognised as competent judges ~~over~~ all persons and causes and the authority of the Estates "of late years called in some doubt" was not to be impugned under pain of treason. All assemblies not sanctioned by Parliament or King were discharged, the place and authority of Bishops was ratified; no person was to speak to the reproach of King and Council or meddle in state affairs and there was an Act defining the process in depriving recalcitrant clergy.⁵⁷ When these measures were made known James Melville followed his uncle over the border.⁵⁸ By allowing ministers to subscribe these Acts with a reservation James brought the majority of them to his side and the Melville phalanx was broken.⁵⁹

When/

- 54. Row p95-107:Calderwood 3 p679-80.
- 55. Calderwood 4 p 3-10.
- 56. 1b pl2.
- 57. AP 3 p292f
- 58. Melville: op cit pl70.
- 59. Calderwood 4 p 209-211, 246-7,351.

When Andrew Melville went into exile he was accompanied by Patrick Forbes who was closely associated with the Melvilles while they were in England.⁶⁰ We may assume that Forbes was in the closest sympathy with the attitude of his brilliant and courageous kinsman for he was at an impressionable age and Calderwood speaks of him as "a forward man for discipline and the banished".⁶¹ It must have been during this interval that he took an opportunity to study at Oxford University. In his oration upon the occasion of the Bishop's death, David Leitch, sub-Principal of King's College Aberdeen, referred to Forbes as having studied at Oxford.⁶² But there is no trace of him in the records of the various Oxford Colleges and it is certain that he did not matriculate.⁶³ We do know, however, that Andrew Melville visited the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and that he spent some time at these seats of learning where he was made welcome.⁶⁴ The probable explanation is that Forbes accompanied his kinsman to Oxford where he lingered awhile in order to complete his studies. Towards the end of 1585 he was back at Berwick where he wrote a letter to James Melville which reveals a close acquaintance with the latest moves of the banished lords as well as an obvious enthusiasm for their cause. It was the purpose of Elizabeth who was seeking to negotiate a Protestant alliance /

60. Melville: *ibid.*

61. Calderwood 4 p381.

62. Funerals p235.

63. *ib* pXXXVI.

64. Melville: *op cit* p 219: McCrie: *op cit* 1. p320-1.

alliance with the needy James to further the return of the Ruthven Lords and Forbes wrote: "The Lord prosper their enterprise. All the faithful here pray to God for the good issue of this matter. We hear of no great preparation the King is making against them," and he informed Melville that he was to go to Hutton Hall and wait there to see how things will go.⁶⁵

If Forbes hoped with the faithful for a return of "discipline" upon the restoration of the Ruthven Lords he was disappointed. The Lords accommodated themselves to the King's humour; there was a new law against seditious speeches;⁶⁶ the clergy had their hopes raised over the stipend question;⁶⁷ Archbishop Adamson moved about as the state-appointed head of kirkmen and the Assembly of May 1586 agreed with the King that Bishops should not be subject to the Provincial Assemblies.⁶⁸

The King could afford to re-instate the banished ministers and when the Melvilles resumed their work at St. Andrews, Patrick Forbes accompanied them. One of Andrew Melville's first objects as Principal had been to train a number of promising students to act as regents and develop his methods of instruction. Patrick who had proceeded from the Arts to the Theology course had become so proficient in the study of Hebrew and Divinity and was of so grave and rich/

- 65. Calderwood 4 p381-2: Funerals pXXXV. Calderwood does not give the complete letter. This is remedied in Shand's introduction to the Funerals.
- 66. AP 3 p375.
- 67. RPC (1st series) 4 p58-9.
- 68. BUK p646f: Spottiswoode 2 p299.

69

rich a character,⁶⁹ that when James Melville entered upon the care of a congregation the Principal offered him the vacant lectureship.⁷⁰ In deference to his father's wish, however, Forbes declined this opportunity of entering upon an academic career.⁷¹ We are told that William Forbes was of an advanced age and desired to see his son and heir marry and prepare himself to succeed to the family estates.⁷² But in 1586 William Forbes had still twelve years in front of him and it is possible that another motive weighed with him - to withdraw his heir from the influence of the Melvilles', which, because of their strong theocratic principles, might involve him in trouble and difficulty with the King.

Patrick returned to Corse and in the summer of 1589 he married Lucretia Spens of Wormiston, at Anstruther in Fife.⁷³ Until William Forbes's death in 1598 the young couple lived at Montrose⁷⁴ - probably at Newmanswells which belonged to the bridegroom's great-grandmother's family, the Painters. Of the Forbes's place of residence Garden says "Praedio quondam rustico, prope urbem Montis Rosarum". Newmanswells was near the town of Montrose and is now well within the burgh boundary. It was during this period that Patrick Forbes's two sons, William and the Famous Doctor John were born and possibly his youngest son, Robert, John first seeing the light of day on 2nd May 1593.⁷⁵

Little/

- 69 Melville : op cit p 18. Melville alludes to Patrick Forbes as "good, godly and kind". cf Garden § 12 f.
 70. Melville: op cit p 254: Garden § 4 p 1.
 71. Funerals p XXXVI.
 72. Garden § 4 p 1: Wodrow: op cit p 83.
 73. Melville: op cit p 240: Garden § 4.
 74. Garden § 4 p 2: Wodrow: op cit p 83.
 75. Certaine Records p XXXIV: Irving: Scottish Writers 2 p 43.
 Garden § 4.

Little is known of Forbes at this time, but we find him taking ⁷⁶an interest in the Corse estates as his father had hoped that he would. It has been suggested that he officiated as a lay preacher in the local churches but this has not been substantiated.⁷⁷

We may briefly note the outstanding ecclesiastical events in the years between Patrick Forbes's departure from St. Andrews and his entry into the Lairdship of Corse. On the plea that the King to avoid taxation was recovering his ancient patrimony formerly alienated, an Act was passed in 1587 annexing to the Crown, with certain specified exceptions, all the old church lands and possessions, the ~~te~~⁷⁸inds as spirituality being expressly reserved with manse, glebes and residences for the maintenance of the clergy. Not only was this Act anti-Papal completing the break with the old Church, but it appeared to be anti-Episcopal. Ecclesiastical lords would now naturally disappear leaving the way clear for a true representation of the kirk in the first Estate and the Crown might well spare something for stipend. These considerations induced the kirk to wink at this wholesale appropriation of church property. But it soon became evident that the resources rendered available by this Act would not be shared by the kirk but would be contested ~~between~~ the Crown and the nobility. James had no intention of abolishing the episcopal office, while financial necessity compelled him to allow ecclesiastical lordships to persist.

With/

76. Exchequer Rolls 21. p340: 22 p51,137,361.

77. Irving: *op cit* 2 p44: Funerals p **xlv** (n)

78. A.P. 3 p431: Birnie *op cit* p37.

With the defeat of the Spanish Armada there was a recrudescence of Romanist activity; the government as well as the kirk was perturbed⁷⁹ and James was forced to make a show against the leading Catholic Earls, Errol and Huntly, towards whom he was personally well disposed.⁸⁰ Good relations developed between Crown and kirk. Meanwhile the royal finances were in a bad way, taxation was severe⁸¹ and the kirk was getting restive about the lack of endowment following the Act of Annexation. In 1592 the Assembly asked for the repeal of this Act, alteration of the Spiritual estate in Parliament to make it representative of the kirk - an alteration which would allow it to press the patrimony question - and the rescinding of the 'Black Acts' of 1584.⁸² The Crown was in no mood to grant the two former requests but something must obviously be done if relations with the kirk were to be preserved.

Accordingly in the Parliament of 1592 an Act was passed "in the most wary terms that could be devised".⁸³ For the time being the Crown played cautiously into the hands of the Presbyterian party. The Assembly was to meet at least annually but the King retained the right to fix time and place - a valuable prerogative which James subsequently turned to good use. Lay patronage could not be uprooted but the right to decide presentations was transferred from the Bishops to the Presbyteries. Bishops were mentioned with vagueness while it was simply stated that the royal supremacy should not/

- 79. RPC (1st series) 4 p248-9(n), 254(n) 332, 351 etc.
- 80. ib p371, 372-4(n) 375f: 5 p103-5, 108-9(n) 118-9 etc.
- 81. Exchequer Rolls 22 pxxxix- xli; 162, 164, 190, 286, 374.
- 82. BUK p786-7.
- 83. Spottiswoode 2 p421.

not infringe the sphere of the spiritual office-bearer. In addition the government made a move which promised to remedy the financial plight of the kirk and the following year a Commission set to work to draft a scheme for the planting and maintenance of churches and clergy.⁸⁵

By 1596 the scheme was complete, It was largely the work of Secretary Lindsay of Balcarres, Lord Menmuir, and provided amongst other things for presbyterial representation in the first Estate and for the payment of stipend on the principle that the whole teind should be devoted to stipends payable locally.⁸⁶ Some such scheme was desperately needed for this same year there were upwards of 400 kirks, exclusive of Argyll and the Isles, without ministers,⁸⁷ while the inability of the kirk to provide adequate stipend kept men of merit out of the ministry.⁸⁸ The King, however, had no intention of encouraging an autonomous Presbyterianism and missives were made ready for the calling of a Convention of Estates and a General Assembly to resolve the points at issue between Church and Crown,⁸⁹ while at the royal request Lindsay had prepared fifty-five pertinent questions upon their relative jurisdictions.⁹⁰ At this juncture events played straight into the King's hands and Lindsay laid aside his scheme as "a thing not like to be done in his days".⁹¹

In/

84. AP 3 p541-2.

85. 1b p553: 4:p33-4.

86. Melville: op cit p33lf: Calderwood 5 p421-433. The Scheme was known as 'The Constant Platt'. For Lindsay cf. J.N.B.

87. Row 174.

88. 1b p172-3: Calderwood 5 p262, 377: St. Andrews Kirk Session Record 2 p815-6(n)

89. Scot: Apologetical Narration p79.

90. Calderwood 5 p577, 585-597: Spottiswoode 3 p41-5.

91. Melville: op cit p346.

In Spetember 1596 the Romanist Earls, Huntly and Errol returned from a banishment, which was never intended to be permanent, with the cordial approval of the King⁹². Their return was the occasion of a final test of strength between the Crown and the theocratic Presbyterian party. Andrew Melville lectured James on the relative authority of the two Kingdoms, Christ's and his⁹³ while his brethren meddled in the domestic affairs of Holyrood⁹⁴ and David Black was warded by the Council for preaching that "all Kings are devil's children".⁹⁵ Clerical propaganda incited an alarmist tumult in Black's favour in Edinburgh. James seized his chance, treated the town as in rebellion, removed the court and Session which deprived it of prestige and trade and made the whole business an excuse to extract 30,000 merks from the burgesses as the price of peace.⁹⁶ The royal action was well calculated to intensify the feeling which was steadily growing against the extreme Presbyterians, several of whom, including Andrew Melville, since 1590 Rector of St. Andrews University,⁹⁷ were removed from office, and to bring into the ascendancy a moderate party more amenable to the will of the Crown.⁹⁸

92. RPC (1st series) 5 p289-290:310-1(n) 314-5(n)317(n)328-331, 343.

93. Melville:opcit p370.

94. BUK p872-3.

95. RPC (1st series) 5 p326-7.334-6,340-2.

96. ib p343(n)

97. Melville:op cit p418: Votiva Tabella p62-3. ^{his professorship} Melville, however, still retained

98. Mathieson:Politics and Religion in Scotland 1. p262-271.

CHAPTER 1111598-1618:Laird of Corse and Minister at Keith

In March 1597 a simultaneous meeting of the Estates and the Assembly took place at Perth under missives from the King. The locus had been well chosen for few ministers could afford to travel far and the northern districts were not so rootedly Presbyterian as Edinburgh and the South-West, while the gathering of nobility and Parliamentarians was calculated to impress and restrain ecclesiastical extremists. In the Assembly the King received a favourable reply as to the lawfulness of an Assembly summoned to meet on his authority before its appointed date¹ and Lindsay's questions were reduced to thirteen which were accepted² - despite the fact that several Presbyteries had ordered their delegates not to commit themselves on these matters.³ James decided the Perth manoeuvre worth repeating and summoned a further simultaneous meeting of Estates and Assembly for Dundee in May. Here the King contrived to place himself in a strategic position in his dealings with the kirk. The Assembly having agreed to his proposal that a standing committee of fourteen members should be set up to consult with him on all ecclesiastical affairs, James took care to see that the majority of the committee were men upon whom he could rely.⁴ He thus very neatly transferred the very instrument - a permanent committee - which/

1. Melville:op cit p404-5.

2. 1b 406-410:Calderwood 5 p608-616:Spottiswoode 3 p49.

3. RPC (1st series) 5 p367(n)

4. BUK p927-8:Calderwood 5 p628f.

which the Assembly had used to govern the church and restrict the Crown,⁵ into his own hands. Calderwood was not wrong when he referred to this Assembly as "the very needle which drew in the thread of the Bishops".⁶

James was determined to be supreme head of church and state and to this end he was working towards Crown - appointed Bishops who, as in England, would rule the church as diocesan~~ans~~ and be the instruments of the royal will in the councils of the kingdom. Far from being the pedantic monarch of tradition James VI was an exceedingly astute diplomatist and politician who realised that his object could only be achieved in easy stages by seizing opportunities and employing patient manipulation.

The Constant Platt had suggested that there should be regular representatives of the clergy in Parliament by commission from all the Presbyteries. The precise proposal was that each Presbytery should send one commissioner and that then out of the total number of commissioners, the other Estates should choose as many as when conjoined with the surviving titular prelates should be considered a fair numerical representation for the kirk. As these titulars died out their⁷ places were to be taken by the Presbyterian representatives. The objects of this scheme which had behind it the consensus of Presbyterian opinion were to secure Parliamentary representation for the kirk and to offset the power of the great nobility/

5. Calderwood 2 p396.

6. 1b 5 p644.

7. Melville:op cit p343.

nobility. The King approached these objects from an entirely different angle with the aid of his recently formed council of ministers and the Parliament of December 1597 gave statutory sanction to a scheme which said nothing about Parliamentary representatives from the Presbyteries but proposed instead that all clergy whom His Majesty should be pleased to provide to prelaties should sit and vote in the first Estate. The new Bishops were to continue as parish ministers and the question of their place in the kirk was to be left to the King and the Assembly.⁸ After two years of conference and discussion⁹ it was agreed in the Assembly which met at Montrose early in 1600, that when a vacancy occurred the King should select one ecclesiastical commissioner for the first Estate - the term 'Bishop' was expressly avoided - from a short list of six submitted by the Assembly; that these commissioners should be answerable to the Assembly, proposing nothing to Council or Parliament without its consent and that they should not be members of Assembly unless elected by their Presbyteries. There was a resolution that the commissioners should be elected annually but James contrived to have it so far modified that the commissioner was required merely to submit his commission every year to the Assembly to be continued or withdrawn as that body, with the King's consent, should think fit.¹⁰ In order to solicit co-operation as far as possible and to allay alarm James had allowed the kirk/

8. AP 4 p130

9. Spottiswoode 3 p 73-5.

10. BUK p954-7:Scot: Apologetical Narration p114.

Kirk a little by-play and "thus the trojan horse, the Episcopacy was brought in ~~b~~busked and covered with caveats, that the danger¹¹ and deformity might not be seen"

The King had not long to wait for an opportunity of going behind the Montrose agreements. The failure of the Gowrie conspiracy against him in August of this same year was astutely made to serve his ecclesiastical aims. The leading Edinburgh clergy^{who} were¹² strongly Presbyterian and favourably inclined towards Gowrie were required to call their congregations and publish the official version of the conspiracy from their pulpits. They refused and were accordingly suspended and banished from the capital¹³ and when, with the exception of Bruce, they made their peace and returned,¹⁴ the King regardless of church procedure had filled their charges. In October James invited the Parliamentary commissioners of the kirk with delegates from the various synods to a conference from which he neatly removed the leading Presbyterian ministers by sending them to see if the deprived city clergy- Bruce excepted - would accept livings elsewhere. At this time there were only three Sees vacant, Aberdeen¹⁵ Ross and Caithness, and to these the King and the remaining members proceeded to nominate - Lindsay to Ross, Blackburn to Aberdeen, Gladstones to Caithness - James having induced compliance by promising/

11. Calderwood 6 p20.
12. 1b p27,46.
13. RBC (1st series) 6 pl48-9.
14. 1b pl61 xxvi.
15. 1b pl65-6(n).
16. Melville: op cit p489.

Kirk a little by-play and "thus the trojan horse, the Episcopacy was brought in ~~b~~busked and covered with caveats, ¹¹ that the danger and deformity might not be seen"

The King had not long to wait for an opportunity of going behind the Montrose agreements. The failure of the Gowrie conspiracy against him in August of this same year was astutely made to serve his ecclesiastical aims. The leading Edinburgh clergy ^{who} were ¹² strongly Presbyterian and favourably inclined towards Gowrie were required to call their congregations and publish the official version of the conspiracy from their pulpits. They refused and were accordingly suspended and banished from the capital ¹³ and when, with the ¹⁴ exception of Bruce, they made their peace and returned, the King regardless of church procedure had filled their charges. In October James invited the Parliamentary commissioners of the kirk with delegates from the various synods to a conference from which he neatly removed the leading Presbyterian ministers by sending them ~~to~~ see if the deprived city clergy- Bruce excepted - would accept livings elsewhere. At this time there were only three Sees vacant, Aberdeen ¹⁵ Ross and Caithness, and to these the King and the remaining members proceeded to nominate - Lindsay to Ross, Blackburn to Aberdeen, Gladstones to Caithness - James having induced compliance by promising/

11. Calderwood 6 p20.

12. ^{1b} p27,46.

13. RBC (1st series) 6 pl48-9.

14. ^{1b} pl61 xxvi.

15. ^{1b} pl65-6(n).

16. Melville: ^{op} cit p489.

ing to recall the Act of Annexation and to cancel the lay lord-¹⁷ships which he had erected out of church property. The new Bishops sat and voted in Parliament next month and began to appear¹⁸ in the Privy Council.

The Assembly which met at Holyrood in November 1602 under¹⁹ summons from the King as the lawful head of the Scots kirk, endorsed the procedure of October 1600. It stated that it favoured the tenure of the great Sees by individual ministers and chose certain brethren to be adjoined to those previously nominated from amongst whom James might fill the vacant Bishoprics.²⁰ Lindsay was appointed to visit the district of Ross, Gladstones was co-joined with another minister to visit Caithness and Sutherland, while Blackburn was to share with another the visitation of²¹ Moray. "Thus under the guise of a mere commission of visitation²² there were three Bishops put in possession of their Bishoprics"

The following year James attained his long cherished ambition of the English succession and in a very short while he could boast that whereas others had failed to rule Scotland with a sword, he²³ now ruled it effectively with his pen. Conscious of a new power and dignity, out of earshot of reproving pulpits, in daily contact with Anglicanism, James was inspired to accelerate the tempo of his ecclesiastical policy in Scotland. He had scarcely become James I./

17. Botfield: Original Letters 1 pXVII.

18. A.P. 4 p258:RPC(1st series) 6 pXXXVI-VII:7 pXXI,XXII. They had as yet no diocesan function. That was the next stage.cf later.

19. RPC(1st series) 6 p397-8.

20. BUK p988:Calderwood 6 pl79:Spottiswoode 3 pl05.

21. BUK p983

22. Melville:op-cit p546-7.

23. RPC.(1st series) 7pXXV.

James I. of England before Betoun the old Roman Archbishop of Glasgow died and he at once bestowed the See upon John Spottiswoode minister of Calder who was designated Bishop of Glasgow and as such took his seat in Parliament and on the Privy Council.²⁴ Extraordinary meetings of the Scottish clergy were now forbidden,²⁵ and the Assembly, overdue on account of the Union of the Crowns and appointed at length for Aberdeen in July 1604, was indefinitely prorogued by his Majesty.²⁶ There had been an unbroken chain of sixty-six Assemblies, the date of the next being fixed before the close of the current one. Never before had the gap between two Assemblies been so long and it was widely feared that the King was going to supersede the Presbyterian courts by bringing in Bishops on the Anglican model.²⁷

At length the King announced that the Aberdeen Assembly would meet in July 1605 and a number of Presbyteries proceeded to elect their delegates. Almost at the last minute the King countermanded the meeting and made it known in an Act of Council that any attempt to hold it would be construed as rebellion.²⁸ A number of Presbyterian clergy, apparantly misled by the Chancellor, Lord Dunfermline, disregarded the order, elected John Forbes of Alford Moderator, protested that the Assembly was lawful and in accordance/

24. 1b 6 p569(n) xxii,xliv.

25. 1b 7 p13-14(n)

26. 1b 6 p479(n).

27. Calderwood 6 p264-273.

28. RPC(1st series) 7 p62.

ance with strict Presbyterian theory fixed the date of the next Assembly. It seems probable that the Privy Council would have let the matter drop but James required action at their hands, not only against those who proceeded to Aberdeen, but against those who intended going and were prevented by the weather.²⁹ Matters followed the familiar course: the ringleaders ~~were~~ warded, declined the jurisdiction of the secular courts, the Council found itself competent to judge and imprisoned them pending His Majesty's pleasure.³⁰ The upshot was that sixteen were admonished, fourteen stood trial and against six of them, including Forbes of Alford, the King made the offence high treason and they were banished for life, the remaining eight being deprived and sent to the Hebrides, Caithness and Ireland.³¹

With these ecclesiastical opponents removed James decided to take the pulse of the kirk with a view to ascertaining how far he might now advance towards Episcopacy and Synodal convocations summoned to meet simultaneously were presented with articles relating to the spiritual authority of King, Bishops and Assemblies.³² The results were not encouraging and James cancelled the Assembly due to meet at Dundee later in the year.³³ The King was now man oeuvring to hasten matters to the point where he could prevail upon an Assembly to accept Bishops and he fell back upon the device of/

29. 1b p82-5,192,471-5:Certaine Records p383f:Melville:op cit p570f
Calderwood 6 p279.

30. Melville:op cit p593,615,616,646f.

31. RPC(1st series) 7 pl34-7:163-166(n),478-486.Botfield:op cit 1
p31-3.

32. Calderwood 6 p391-6.

33. RPC(1st series) 7p218-9,494-7.

of a clerical conference to be held this time in London, to which the leading Presbyterian clergy who remained, including the two Melvilles and Scot of Cupar, together with pro-³⁴Episcopalians like Gladstones and Spottiswoode were summoned.

Meanwhile James took a big stride in the direction of an established Episcopacy by an important piece of Parliamentary legislation. In July 1606 an Act of Restitution was passed which, prefaced with a declaration of the royal supremacy over all persons and causes, stated that the ancient constitution of Parliament was almost subverted because of the indirect abolition of the Bishoprics by the Act of Annexation in 1587 and went on to annul thus act in so far as it affected the Bishoprics and their temporalities provided the Bishops paid stipend to the Ministers at annexed churches.³⁵ The Act of Annexation had jumbled the kirk lands of all sorts miscellaneously. The Bishops' lands were now completely extricated, leaving the other churchlands with the Crown or with the lay lords who had acquired them. For this measure of restitution, made in the interest not of the kirk but of Episcopacy, James purchased support by the erection on a large scale of lay lordships out of the monastic lands that remained to him.³⁶

The King now concentrated upon the task of manipulating his Parliamentary Bishops into the position of Diocesan administrators. The/

34. *ib* plvii-lviii.

35. A.P. 4 p281-41 RPC (1st series) 7 p227: Birnie *op cit* p38-39.

36. A.P. 4 p311-461 *passim*.

The London Conference was overwhelmingly in favour of the
 move.³⁷ The objectors were unscrupulously handled. The Melvilles
 were banished for life, while the others who had followed their
 lead were eventually allowed to return to Scotland defeated men.³⁸
 The Presbyterian party was leaderless and broken and kirkmen were
 weary of the long ecclesiastical struggle, but the answer returned
 by the synods and re-action within the kirk to the Act of Restitu-
 tion³⁹ made it appear unlikely that an orthodox Assembly would be
 a pliable instrument in the royal hands. James therefore decided
 upon an ingenious substitute which could pass under the same name-
 a clerical convention of deputies from all or most of the Presby-
 teries to be nominated by himself in missive letters, with members
 of the nobility similarly summoned and with lay assessors. An⁴⁰
 assembly thus constituted duly met at Linlithgow in December 1606.
 On the plea of the urgent need to suppress Romanism and to smoothe
 out ecclesiastical differences, James secured the acceptance of
 a proposal that there should be 'Constant Moderators' in the Pres-
 byteries. The Assembly there and then proceeded to appoint these
 and wherever a Bishop resided within the bounds of the Presbytery
 he was appointed its Constant Moderator. Caveats were entered
 limiting the powers of the new Moderators and making them answer-
 able to the General Assembly.⁴¹ There was some opposition to the
 move in several localities and the Privy Council had to take steps

to/

37. RPC(1st series) 7 plviii.

38. Melville:op cit p669f.

39. 1b p636-641: Calderwood 6 p485.

40. RPC (1st series) 7 p282-3(n).

41. BUK pl027-1040.

to enforce the decree.⁴² Before very long James had advanced another step, stretching the Act of the Linlithgow Assembly so as to make it apply to the Provincial Synods.⁴³ In June 1607 the Synod of Fife was required to accept the Archbishop of St. Andrews as its Constant Moderator on the grounds of the Linlithgow ruling⁴⁴ and next month James required every Synod to elect a Bishop as its Constant Moderator where one was resident within the bounds.⁴⁵

In view of the feeling which these moves aroused the King thought it expedient to prorogue the 1607 Assembly⁴⁶ and when it met the next year he tactfully allowed it a free hand against the Romanists.⁴⁷ This Assembly which met at Linlithgow, was constituted in the same manner as its predecessor and was most accommodating. All the Bishops were commissioners of Assembly and their commissions were readily renewed. Constant Moderators were accepted and a Committee was appointed to investigate "difference of judgement⁴⁸ concerning the external government and discipline of the kirk". The King knew now that with a little dexterous management he could press his policy to its conclusion.

The Privy Council urged from London had been increasingly interfering in the jurisdiction of the kirk courts⁴⁹ and in June 1609 the Bishops in their several dioceses were restored with full inquisitional powers to their ancient jurisdiction in spiritual causes.⁵⁰ /

42. RPC (1st series) 7 p300-302.

43. *ib* p347-351.

44. *ib* p380.

45. *ib* p416-7.

46. *ib* p451-2.

47. *ib* 8 p139-141, 162-3, 172-3,

48. BUK p1060-1063.

49. RPC (1st series) 6 pX111: 8 p66, 82, 328, 330.

50. A.P. 4 p430-1: Botfield: *op cit* p406-407.

causes. Within a year two Courts of High Commission had been instituted on the English model capable of punishing all offences which might be construed as ecclesiastical.⁵¹ These courts which had been established by royal Proclamation, one in each Archbishopric "exalted the Bishops far above any prelate that ever was in Scotland ... put the King in possession of that which he had a long time desired ... the royal prerogative and absolute power to use the bodies and goods of the subjects at pleasure without form or process of the common law"⁵² Very shortly, in June 1610, an Assembly constituted after the manner of the two previous Linlithgow Assemblies met at Glasgow, the preliminaries being managed by the two Archbishops Gladstones and Spottiswoode,⁵³ while the Royal Commissioner, the Earl of Dunbar, received from James promise of the sum of 10,000 merks Scots "to be divided and dealt upon such persons as you shall hold fitting by the advice of the Archbishops ..."⁵⁴ a letter which Spottiswoode suppresses. Spottiswoode was easily elected Moderator and by dexterous management proceeded to work the royal will, all disputed points being referred to selected committees whose conclusions the Assembly was simply called upon to endorse.⁵⁵ In the end it was agreed that the calling and appointment of times for Assemblies belonged to the royal prerogative; that the half-yearly Provincial Synods should meet as Diocesan Synods with the Bishops as 'ex officio' Moderators; that all excommunications and absolutions must be ratified by the Diocesan; that all presentations/

51. BUK p1078,1084:RPC (1st series) 8 p417-420:Scot:op cit p318-221: Melville:op cit p787f: Calderwood 7 p57.
 52. Melville:op cit p792. (Scot op cit p177.)
 53. Calderwood 7 p91-3:BUK pli,1039,1083-4:Botfield:op cit lp236-240:
 54. RPC (1st series) 8 p844 cf Calderwood 7 p97:Spottiswoode 3p184,207
 55. Calderwood 7 p94-103.

tions rest with the Bishop who is to supervise the trial of the presentee; that in all trials for deposition the Bishop preside; that upon presentation to livings all ministers must take an oath of allegianceto the King as supreme in things temporal and spiritual; that visitations⁵⁶ of the Diocese and the supervision of the clergy belong to the Bishop. This triumph for the King's ecclesiastical policy however, was only secured on the understanding, expressly stated, that the Bishops " be subject in all things concerning their life, conversation, office and benefice to the censure of the General Assembly and being found culpable should, with His Majesty's consent be deprived".⁵⁷ When Parliament met in 1612 this article was deliberately omitted from the ratification of the Glasgow findings and all legislation derogatory to the authority of Bishops, including the pro-Presbyterian statute of 1592, was⁵⁸ repealed.

In this Parliament there occurred a significant outburst⁵⁹ of feeling over the political implications of the Episcopacy which James had so astutely and so patiently laboured to introduce. The nobility had already shown resentment at the place and authority of the new Bishops. It was openly alleged that jealousy at the promotion of these Bishops to positions of authority in the state was behind the encouragement which Lord Dunfermline gave to Forbes of Alford to hold the fateful Aberdeen Assembly. At the time of the Act of Restitution James had found it necessary to ratify existing/

56. BUK p1085-1104.

57. **ib** p1097.

58. A.P. 4 p439f.

59. Certaine Records p426: Spottiswoode 3 p204-205.

existing erections and to make others by way of appeasing the nobility, while the placing of the Bishops between the Earls and Barons at the opening procession of the Parliaments of 1606 and 1609 increased antipathy.⁶⁰ The appointment of Archbishop Spottiswoode as an extraordinary Judge of the Court of Session⁶¹ and the creation of the two Courts of High Commission caused further misgivings amongst the nobility, And in the Parliament of 1612 James gave the nobles further cause to fear that he intended to use the Bishops to offset their influence ~~as~~ ~~the~~ as the instruments of Divine Right Absolutism. Before any business could come before the Scots Estates it had to pass through the sieve of an agenda committee known as the Lords of the Articles. This committee drafted all Bills which under James VI had come to be simply voted upon 'en bloc' on the last day of Parliament.⁶² In the past the representatives of each Estate on this committee had been variously chosen. But in 1612, anxious to secure the desired ecclesiastical legislation and still more anxious on the pretext of the Princess Elizabeth's marriage to collect a tax of £240,000,⁶³ James applied a method of electing the Articles which had become customary,⁶⁴ the prelates and nobles choosing each others representatives. The nobles were told/

⁶⁰ Mathieson: op cit 1 p307; Calderwood 7 p38.

⁶¹ RPC (1st series) 8 p405.

⁶² A.P. 4 pl23, 191m281 etc.

⁶³ RPC (1st series) 9 p475-6.

⁶⁴ Foreign Calendar: Randolph to Cecil 3rd June 1563.

Rait : The Parliaments of Scotland p366f

told by the King which Bishops to appoint and showed their appreciation of the scheme by choosing some of the other prelates, though this could make no difference to the measure of royal control, since they all owed their office to the Crown. The Bishops on the other hand, having been told which nobles to appoint obeyed implicitly.

What happened next is uncertain but either the whole Estates of prelates and nobles or else, as seems more likely, the prelates and nobles already elected proceeded to elect the shire and burgess members. ⁶⁵

This method of choosing the Lords of the Articles and the taxation which it ensured the King aroused a good deal of feeling and one Privy Councillor, who so far forgot himself as to protest, was suspended on a royal warrant. ⁶⁶

After the Glasgow Assembly the Scottish Episcopate required one thing to bring it into conformity with Anglican Episcopacy - The Apostolic Succession. Once this was conferred Catholic theory would be satisfied and a final blow delivered against Presbyterianism.

The Presbyterians recognised the value of succession and preserved it by making the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery a preliminary to the ministry of the Sacraments, ⁶⁷ but they steadfastly maintained the attitude taken by the reformers in the Confession of

Faith of 1560: That "lineal descent from a perpetual succession of Bishops is not necessary". ⁶⁸ Accordingly at the behest of King

James, /

65. Maitland Club Miscellany 3 p115.

66. RPC (1st series) 9 p505.

67. BUK p496,905,925: Calderwood 5 p584-6.

68. Historical Papers (Christian Unity Association) p24: Knox 2 p193.

This quotation combines the Scots & Latin texts. The Scots says "lineal descence"; the Latin says "a successione perpetua episcoporum". The Latin dates from 1572.

James, Archbishop Spottiswoode and Bishops Lamb of Brechin and Hamilton of Galloway journeyed to London in October 1610 and received Episcopal consecration at the hands of four of their English brethren that "they might at their return give ordination to those at home and so the⁶⁹ adversaries mouthes be stopped." Neither Canterbury nor York took part in the consecration ceremony for James was tactful enough not to give the impression that the Scots kirk was in process⁷⁰ of being brought under the English primacy. In May 1611 Gladstones was able to inform His Majesty that all the Bishops of his Scottish Province had submitted to consecration,⁷¹ but if James had also hoped to eliminate Presbyterianism by bringing the rank and file of the ministry into the traditional Apostolic Succession at the hands of the Bishops he was disappointed for the newly consecrated prelates made no attempt to impose episcopal ordination upon those who had received⁷² only the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.

By 1612 the King had achieved an ecclesiastical revolution in Scotland. That he was able to maintain it was in no small part owing to the fact that his Bishops were wise and moderate men " who took little upon them."⁷³ At the time of the Glasgow Assembly James had contemplated the abrupt abolition of Presbyteries but the Bishops had⁷⁴ persuaded him to hold his hand, and Gladstones spoke for his brethren/

69. Spottiswoode 3 p208-209.

70 ^{1b} p209.

71. Melville:op cit p804.

72. Spottiswoode 3 p209.

73. Autobiography and Life of Blair (Wodrow Society) p12.

74. RPC (1st series) 8 pXXVIII: Calderwood 7 p97.

ren when he informed His Majesty: "The great multitude of the ministry are desirous that Presbyteries shall stand, but directed and governed by the Bishops and so could refer great matters to be done only by the consent and authority of the Bishops"⁷⁵. // Such was the background against which Patrick Forbes was called upon to make what, was, up to that time, the greatest decision of his life. For several years after he returned to Corse upon the death of his father in 1598, Forbes "continued assiduously to pursue his studies not neglecting the culture and improvement of his family property"⁷⁶. But events conspired to change his placid way. From a Protestant point of view the state of religion in the North East corner of Scotland was, at this time, a matter for the gravest concern. The measures proposed by various General Assemblies against Roman Catholics and the persistent continuance of "superstitious customs" show that the Old Church had never completely lost its grip in Scotland.⁷⁷ Romanist activity which had flared up under Esmé Stuart and after the defeat of the Armada, continued over the length and breadth of the country.⁷⁸ Between 1580-1600 Scotland was taken over by various Orders of the Papal Church as a missionary country and so promising was their work that in the latter year Pope Clement VIII founded a Scots College at Rome as a nursery for native missionaries and it was speedily endowed.⁷⁹ In a few years missionaries began to filter into Scotland and were at work everywhere, sometimes openly,⁸⁰ but more often in disguise and Presbyteries were actively enquiring into/

75. Botfield: op cit 1 p245: cf: Calderwood 7 p59, 129-131: Scot: op cit p241.

76. Garden 4. For Forbes's succession of Service of Heirs. August 29th 1598, Chancery.

77. BUK p262f, 389-390 et passim.

78. McLean: The Counter Reformation in Scotland p61f

79. Blakhal: A Brief Narrative pxxv-xxvi.

80. RPC (1st series) 6 pl72, 355, 361, 716 etc

into absence from communion. Nowhere was Romanist activity more intense or successful than in the North East, where the people's predilection for Episcopacy was in some measure due to their lingering regard for the old faith and where many influential Roman Catholic families such as the Huntlys, the Errols and the Craigs, were concentrated.⁸² The leniency of King James towards Huntly and the leading Papists, whose families openly attended mass and continuously harboured Jesuits, annoyed the kirk and intensified the difficulties of the situation for Protestantism while the Huntly quarter of Scotland came to be regarded as "the chief scene of that vain struggle to restore the ancient religion".⁸³ Indeed at this juncture Protestantism seemed likely to be swept away in the districts around Aberdeen for while Romanism was steadily gaining ground⁸⁴ the consequences of the Aberdeen Assembly of the previous summer still further weakened the kirk in these parts. There was already a serious shortage of clergy all over the land and the majority of those who had gone to Aberdeen in defiance of the King and who were now deprived, came from the country round about.⁸⁵ One of the areas which was most affected was that around Corse Castle where, ~~in~~ⁱⁿ 1610, there were upwards of twenty vacant charges.⁸⁶

The/

81. Selections from the Records of the Presbytery of Lanark p 6

Selections from the Minutes of the Synod of Fife l. p4.

82. Miscellany of the Spalding Club 2 pl51: Book of Bon Accord p229.

83. Blakhal: op cit pxx-xxi, Xlllf.

84. RPC (1st series) 7 p355: Funerals pXXXVlll. cf Mair: Records of Presbytery of

85. Melville: op cit p650

Ellon (1898) passim

86. Funerals pxlii

The shortage of clergy had forced the kirk against its will to allow ⁸⁷lay preachers to continue and faced with a grave home mission ~~problem~~ the clergy of the local Presbyteries turned their thoughts to Forbes, who, it seems, was in the habit of giving instruction to his own household, and asked him if he would not extend his ministrations. The religious situation with which he was confronted - the threat of Romanism, the ignorance of the people and their low standard of morals - could hardly have failed to distress a deeply religious man and Forbes readily undertook to deliver a discourse each Sunday in his own ⁸⁸parish church which was one of the many standing vacant. It is interesting to note the Presbyteries taking the initiative in the settling of a lay preacher - an office originally at the discretion of the Superintendent. Bishop Blackburn and the Synod of Aberdeen were delighted when they heard of Forbes's undertaking and urged him to advance a step further and be ordained to the ministry. This request often repeated with the offer of the pastoral care of any parish in the neighbourhood, ⁸⁹was as often refused. Then there occurred the event which brought Forbes to the turning point in his life.

In the summer of 1611 John Chalmers minister at Keith seriously wounded himself in a fit of depression. Chalmers had not long been at Keith. From 1601-1610 he had held the office of sub-Principal at King's College Aberdeen, ⁹⁰where since 1606, Patrick Forbes's son John, /

87. BUK p455: McGregor: The Scottish Presbyterian Polity p47-8

88. Garden 5 p2.

89. ib 6 p2: Wodrow: op cit p84.

90. Anderson: Officers and Graduates of King's College p40: Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 p319: Calderwood 7 p160-3.

John, the future doctor, had been a student. The two men had probably met and certainly they would be acquainted with each other's work. Here in all likelihood is the explanation of the visit which Forbes now paid to the dying Chalmers at Keith where his gentle admonition and kindly ministrations led the doomed pastor to a deep and genuine repentance. Chalmers had requested the patron of the living, Lord Salton, to appoint a Mr. Lesley as his successor, but he was so impressed by the Laird of Corse that he saw in him the man most likely to diminish the evil effects which his rash act might have for the church and earnestly desired Forbes to take over the charge. The neighbouring clergy and parishoners shared, if indeed they did not actually add this view, and before very long, either late in 1611 or early in 1612, Patrick Forbes accepted the call and was ordained for the work of the ministry in Keith at the hands of a Bishop who had recently received the Apostolic Succession. ^{92.}

All that we know of Forbes makes it seem most likely, as Garden has suggested, that "his heart had always inclined towards the sacred ministry." ⁹³ Why, then, did he hesitate so long? Wodrow offers the explanation that Forbes "had not got over his difficulties from his principle as to Presbyterian government." ⁹⁴ Archbishop Gladstones certainly/

entry into King's College. Grub & DNB copy his mistake

91. Fasti Aberdonenses p lxxii. Garden is wrong in giving 1607 as the year of Forbes's
 92. Garden § 7 pl-2: Wodrow op cit p86. Dowden: Scottish Bishops p396.
 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 p319: 7. p 330.
 93. Garden § 7 p2.
 94. Wodrow op cit p84.

certainly had information to this effect and ordered him to cease from preaching until he should be ordained.⁹⁵ Rather than take this step at that time, Forbes at once complied, being content to worship in the local church and to confine his ministrations to his own household as formerly.⁹⁶ The whole matter came to the ears of the King and in February 1610, Forbes wrote a letter to His Majesty - which according to Doctor John Forbes laid the foundation of his favour with James - informing him of the circumstances which led to his preaching in the local church and stating that he could not accede to numerous requests to enter the ministry "upon divers respectful considerations". He concluded by saying that he had not sought to obtrude, was willing to forbear and to be demeaned by the King if his conduct has given offence.⁹⁷

Patrick Forbes was a man of peace, content to till his fields and read his books but for the call to labour for the souls of men. And that high service, as the tone of his letter to the King and his ready obedience to the command of Archbishop Gladstones show, he was unwilling to make the subject of controversy. We may fairly conclude that the "considerations" which kept him from the ministry during these years were the responsibility of entering upon a pastoral charge in unsettled and controversial times and the deep respect which he had for Presbyterian principles due to the influence and teaching of the Melvilles.

Throughout the year during which he hesitated to enter the ministry/

95. Garden § 6 pl: Wodrow: ib.

96. Funerals pxlii

97. ib.

try, Forbes was carefully pursuing his studies and with special reference to the practical issue for himself and for the kirk as the works which he shortly published make quite clear. ⁹⁸ He was very largely concerned with the questions of the place and authority of reformed churches and the Apostolic Succession. His writings reveal long and careful careful thought and show appreciation of the value of an historical Episcopacy, not indeed as indispensable to a true church according to strict Catholic theory, but as useful in conveying truth and maintaining discipline. There could therefore, be no reason for refusing to accept an Episcopacy which seemed likely to be efficacious. And in Scotland by 1612 the ecclesiastical issue appeared to have been resolved with Bishops and Presbyteries co-factioning under the Crown. To many, after the union of the Crowns, Conformity between the two national churches seemed desirable, while the clergy as a whole wished for peace and realised that their only hope of stipend augmentation lay in the King. It was now obvious that Presbyterianism in opposition to the King, in an age when Kings claimed, and were widely held to possess, ⁹⁹ an absolute sovereignty by Divine Right, would merely rend and weaken both church and state, while Presbyterianism in conjunction with a moderate Episcopacy supported by the Crown, promised stability and strength to both. Scot's insinuation that Patrick Forbes "undertook not the ministry till Bishoprics were in dealing" may be ¹⁰⁰ passed over as an extremist sneer. The simple truth is that Forbes came to accept traditional Episcopacy because of his deep concern for the/

98. Garden? 6 pl of Chapter LX.

99. Figgis: The Divine Right of Kings p44-50 etc: Prothero: Statutes and Constitutional Documents p410-11.

100. Scot: Apologetical Narration p254.

the Protestant position in Scotland. Some years later he wrote thus of the Bishops who had been established in the Scottish Church "Yet now they being established and set at the rudder of our church I am so far from the judgement of them who would have no godly nor singularly gifted men to accept them, that I think it so far from a well informed zeal, as it is rather in my judgement ^{sort of} a transportation with the love of their own opinion...they will put us ^{rather} in peril to have no church at all".¹⁰¹

Very little is known of Patrick Forbes's ministry at Keith. In July 1615 he took part in a Presbyterial visitation of Rothiemay and a year later was excused a similar visitation as he was then away somewhere in the south.¹⁰² During the first years of his incumbency Forbes was very busy with his pen giving to the church some of the fruits of his assiduous studies. The Commentary on the Apocalypse first published in 1613 was "newly corrected and ~~the~~ defects and errors of the first edition supplied and amended" and a second edition issued in 1614,¹⁰³ *along with which* the author also published some shorter treatises: 'Letter to A Romish Recusant'; 'A Defence of the Lawful Calling of the Ministers of ^{the} Reformed Churches' and 'A Short Discovery of their Divers Deceits'. These works had all one primary aim: to confound the arrogant claims of the Romanists and to defend the position of Reformed Churches.¹⁰⁴ Forbes remained.

101. Funerals p lviii

102. Gordon: History of Scots Affairs l.pliii

103. An Leamed Commentarie: Title Page. cf J.F. Kellas Johnston: Bib. Aber. I

104. cf Chapter IX.



ed at Keith until 1618 and of his life there Garden, his principal biographer tells us nothing, nor has Forbes himself left us any record of his work, but we may assume that he performed the various duties that appertained to the pastoral office with that diligence and kindness which above all else were to make him "a star of the first magnitude in the church".¹⁰⁵ Wodrow says that he "was made much of, for he was among the most considerable men that they (the Bishops)¹⁰⁶ had brought over to their side" and the part which he played during these years in the affairs of the church at large ~~marked~~ him down as a man destined for high office.

The kirk had been brought to a general conformity with the Church of England as regards polity but it still differed in its ideals and forms of worship. As the Reformation movement in Scotland gained strength the Anglican Book of Common Prayer had been gradually superseded in Public worship by the ~~less liturgical & more radical~~¹⁰⁷ Knoxian Book of Common Order. The corrupt Tulchan Episcopate established along Anglican lines and the influence of Andrew Melvill deprived the Anglican Book of any chance it might have had of ~~making~~ **head**way in the kirk. During the latter part of the sixteenth century there were several editions of the Book of Common Order but with additional prayers,¹⁰⁸ a fact which suggests that "set forms" were not/

105. The House of Forbes p316 (quotation).

106. Wodrow: op cit p87.

107. McMillan: Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church p38f: Cowan Bibliography of the Book of Common Order pl9-22.

108. McMillan: op cit p61-2.

not too popular and that the form of worship which the Book provided could bear improvement. The move for a revised edition in the Burntisland Assembly of 1601 and the attempt of the Assembly to restrict new prayers to those introduced with its consent point in the same direction ¹⁰⁹ and we are informed that by 1610 the Book was falling into disuse. ¹¹⁰ Yet in the years 1618-1620 ¹¹¹ and again in 1638 ¹¹² when liturgical controversy was acute it was widely appealed to as the authorised standard of worship and was used throughout this period by both Presbyterians and Episcopalians. ¹¹³ The position in the kirk with regard to Divine worship was ~~briefly this: except for special services such as Communion and Ordination and the forms included for use by readers,~~ **the Book of Common Order was only a Directory for worship. It was increasingly less regarded, the ministers using prayers of their own which upon occasion were "a shame to all religion".** ^{114.}

At the same time ecclesiastical controversy had not permitted the drafting of **canons** with a view to making discipline and observance uniform in the interests of efficiency and it had been out of the question to prepare a generally acceptable form for the ordination of clergy. At a conference of Bishops in 1611 it was agreed that no ministers should be admitted without the trial and imposition of hands by the Diocesan with two or three clergy, and that a form of ordination should be printed and strictly observed, but nothing definite had been/

109. BUK p970-1.

110. McMillan:op cit p70.

111. Calderwood 7 p368-9,422.

112. Peterkin:Records of the Kirk p33.

113. McMillan:op cit p68-9.

114. A Large Declaration pl6.

been accomplished.

In 1615 with a view to remedying matters, Spottiswoode who had recently succeeded Gladstones in the Archbishopric of St. Andrew composed for the guidance of the King a list of what he considered to be the defects in the Scottish Church. It required a uniform order for the election and ordination of ministers; canons for keeping both clergy and people in order; emendations at several points in various services and it lacked a form of divine service with the result that ministers framed their own prayers which often proved impertinent. Finally the Archbishop wisely advised that care be taken to have these defects remedied in a General Assembly which could be modelled upon Anglican Convocation.¹¹⁶

James had already begun to move towards the desired conformity on his own account. The first Book of Discipline while condemning saints days had refrained from including the three great festivals of Easter, Whitsunday and Ascension.¹¹⁷ But very soon there was a change of attitude and in 1566 the Scots Reformers while approving the Helvetic Confession took exception to all festival days.¹¹⁸ The kirk however was not unanimous on the matter. The Calendar published in the Book of Common Order in 1564 and in subsequent editions contained the great festivals and several lesser ones.¹¹⁹ In 1570/

115. Grub 2 p299.

116. Botfield:op cit 2 p445-6.

117. Knox 2 pl85-6.

118. 1b 6 p 547-9.

119 McMillan:op cit p306.

1570 the Assembly agreed that Easter Communion might be given where
¹²⁰superstition~~n~~ had been removed, while five years later it asked
¹²¹for the abolition of all saints days and Christmas. Meanwhile
 in various parts of the country saints days continued to be observed
 With the fear of Romanist re-action there came a hardening in the
¹²²attitude of Assemblies and in 1596 festival days were enumerated
¹²³amongst the corruptions~~in~~ the kirk. After 1600 James always kept
 Christmas Day and in 1609 he ordered the Court of Session at Edinbur
¹²⁴to rise for a Christmas recess. With Episcopacy working fairly
 smoothly in the kirk and with the Presbyteries denuded of authority
 and partaking once again of the nature of "the brethren of the exer-
 cise", James decided to open a conformity campaign. Early in 1614
 a royal proclamation ordered communion to be celebrated in all chur-
¹²⁵ches on a Sunday which happened to be Easter Day. The measure was
¹²⁶repeated the following year and Easter Day was definitely named.
 It was the strict Presbyterian custom to avoid communion on all
 festivals - with apparently the exception of Whitsunday - two or
 four ordinary Sundays in the year being appointed for the adminis-
¹²⁷tration of the Sacrament. The people as a whole appear to have
 responded to the royal commands and early in 1616 James ordered the
 keeping/

120. Calderwood 3 p5.

121. BUK p339 c^f p332,334.

122. Calderwood 3 p350,503 Grub 2 pl97.

123. Calderwood 5 p410.

124 *ib* 7 p23,53.

125 *ib* pl91. Row p302:RPC (1st series) 10p215-7:Botfield *op* cit lp448 (450.

126. Calderwood 7 pl96:RPC (1st series) 10 p316-7.

127. McMillan *op* cit pl90f 317.

keeping of Christmas, ~~Easter~~, Whitsunday and Ascension Day in the
 128
 university chapels.

There was no real opposition and the time seemed ripe to p
 press forward. The King realised with Spottiswoode that some kirk
 convention would be necessary if all parties were to be brought
 into the conformity which he desired and he resolved upon an
 Assembly in a district where the consensus of opinion was likely
 to be favourable. Aberdeen was the place chosen and a royal pro-
 clamation ordered the Assembly for August 1616 ostensibly to com-
 129
 bat Popery which was strong in the north. The Assembly of 1610
 had not raised the question of the place of Bishops in future
 assemblies- whether they were to be present by election as com-
 missioners of the Presbyteries or in their own right as Diocesans
 It is a commentary upon the control which Episcopacy had achieved
 at the expense of Presbyterianism that the Bishops were present in
 this Assembly as of right; that the delegates attended on their
 missives and that Spottiswoode in virtue of his office as Primate
 130
 took the moderator's chair.

It was during this Assembly that Patrick Forbes came to the
 fore as one of the recognised leaders of the church. In accordance
 with/

128. Botfield: ~~op~~ cit 2 p.806.

129R.P.C(1st series) 10 p580-1.

130. Scot: ~~op~~ cit p241: Calderwood 7 p222-3.

with the custom of the kirk the opening day was observed as a fast and given over to ^{the} preaching of the Word. It was a tribute to the high regard in which he was held by all parties that Forbes was chosen to deliver the first of the inaugural addresses on this important occasion followed by Archbishop Spottiswoode and William Forbes, the distinguished scholar and ^{later} Bishop of Edinburgh. ¹³¹ In order to induce the members to be compliant and possibly, as Calderwood suggested to put off time in the hope ^{that} ministers from the south who might be recalcitrant would withdraw, several days were spent in elaborating ¹³² measures against the Papists. It was partly with a view to testing their affirmations and denials that a new Confession of Faith was introduced. This work stressed the Calvinistic doctrine of pre-destination even more than its predecessor of 1560 ¹³³ and was ordered to be universally received in all the parishes. ¹³⁴ It has to be noted that the doctrinal ground work of the kirk was not as yet in dispute - Episcopalians and Presbyterians alike were good Calvinists - and the new Confession like the old one, received general approbation, the Bishop of Galloway speaking for his brethren when he declared that ¹³⁵ "all things were done in great wisdom, learning and godliness".

To achieve conformity in worship was another question and in order to remedy the objections listed by Spottiswoode, committees were appointed. There was to be a short Catechism for intending communicants/

131. BUK p1116.

132. 1b p1117f: Calderwood 7 p221.

133. Knox 2 p95f: Calderwood 7 p233f: BUK p1132-9.

134. BUK p1123, 1127.

135. Calderwood 7 p242. C.E. McCrie: *Confessions of the Church of Scotland* (1907) p27f

cants, a new form of divine service and a code of Canons compiled from the records of the Assemblies and, where these were defective, from the ancient Canons of Councils and convocations. Patrick Forbes was not named amongst the few who were to be responsible for the draft Catechism and Liturgy, but he was on the committee chosen to compile the new Canons.¹³⁶ He was also appointed to the much larger and more important committee which was to meet with the two Archbishops to consider ways and means of arresting the dilapidation of benefices.¹³⁷ At the behest of Archbishop Spottiswoode this larger committee was given full powers in the revision of the draft ~~of~~ Liturgy and the recently prepared Confession of Faith and was to see both works through the press.¹³⁸ The names of the clergy who, apart from the Bishops, formed this committee suggest that they were carefully selected as men of learning and influence.

Shortly before the Aberdeen Assembly Bishop Blackburn of Aberdeen had died and "the greatest part" of the clergy of that diocese taking advantage of the convocation got together and made known their wish that the King should offer the vacant Bishopric to Patrick Forbes "as the best of all men for that seat".¹³⁹ Archbishop Spottiswoode shared the views and the desire of the Aberdeen Presbyters,¹⁴⁰ but the King translated Alexander Forbes from the See of Caithness which he had held since 1606.¹⁴¹ No doubt James would have been willing enough to grant the petition but while he was pressing a difficult piece of ecclesiastical

136. BUK pl124.

137. 1b pl131: Botfield:op cit 2 p481-3: Calderwood 7 p229-230.

138. BUK pl132.

139. Botfield:op cit 2 p553-4: Funerals p206+7: Wodrow:op cit p90.

140. Funerals pliv.

141. Keith: Catalogue of Scottish Bishops p217.

al policy he thought it advisable to keep expectants in hope. Accordingly he made a translation which was kept quiet for some while and sufficiently delayed the nomination of the new Bishop.¹⁴² Besides Alexander Forbes was not a young man and may actually have been in failing health when the move was mooted.¹⁴³ The Aberdeen Bishopric would soon be vacant again and the attitude of Patrick Forbes to the ecclesiastical innovations which the King intended would decide the suitability of a man towards whom he personally inclined.¹⁴⁴

The latitude which the Assembly was allowed against the Roman Catholics was not altogether dictated by diplomacy. The Registers of the Privy Council reveal that there was an intensive Romanist campaign in the country and the Council was forced to stiffen its own attitude.¹⁴⁵ James Moffet a Jesuit who had arrived in Scotland in 1611 and who claimed to have met with extraordinary success was before the Council in his mass-clothes.¹⁴⁶ In February 1616 another Jesuit, John Ogilvie was put to death under a charge of treason for claiming that the Pope could depose the King.¹⁴⁷ While Jesuits were secretly conducting mass, spreading propaganda and undertaking the education of children, and the Assembly was going zealously to work against them and their adherents, the Earl of Huntly, who had been openly contemptuous of the kirk and High Commission arrived in Aberdeen armed with an absolution from the Archbishop of Canterbury and a covering letter from the King and petitioned to have his sentence of excommunication formally raised. The/

142. Botfield: *op cit* 2 p485.

143. Calderwood 7 p284

144. *su cf supra.*

145. RPC (1st series) 10 pxcvii f.

146. *ib* p284.

147. McLean: *The Counter Reformation in Scotland* p99-103.

W.E. Brown: *John Ogilvie (1925)*

The Assembly had the gravest misgivings over the affair, but James and the English Primate mollified the Bishops and it was agreed to send a small and influential commission to interview Huntly. The Earl was able to satisfy his examiners and was duly absolved on the last day of the Assembly. The point to note is that Patrick Forbes was the only parish minister on this commission, the other members being the two Archbishops, the Bishop of Brechin, the Depute-Treasurer and Lord Binning.

For the rest the Assembly agreed that Baptism should be administered when desired; that children of six should make confession of their faith before the Bishop, receive periodical examination and at the age of fourteen be admitted as communicants; that communion should be four times a year in the burghs and twice in the country towns of which Easter was to be one. These measures, however, did not go far enough for James and he ordered five articles to be inserted amongst the canons which the Assembly had agreed to prepare. Briefly these were as follows:

1. The Holy Communion was to be received kneeling that it might be more reverent.
2. In cases of necessity Communion was to be administered in private houses.
3. In cases of necessity Baptism was to be given in private houses.
4. The Birth, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus Christ and the sending down of the Holy Spirit (Whitsunday) were to be commemorated.

5./

148. RDC (1st series) 10 p561-4.
 149. Spottiswoode 3 p233-5.
 151. BUK pl128,1129: Calderwood 7 p229,230.
 150. Botfield:op cit 2 p486.
 152. Spottiswoode 3 p236-7.

5. Children on reaching 8 years of age were to be catechised and then confirmed by the Bishop.

Spottiswoode was alarmed at the prospect of inserting canons such as these which had "at no time been **m**otioned to the church" and put the King off by reminding him of his forthcoming visit when the matter could be taken up on the spot.¹⁵³ By way of preparing the ground for his Scottish visit James despatched north copies of a short Catechism 'God and the King', which the Council on his instructions ordered to be purchased by every household and to be taught in the schools and universities.¹⁵⁴ This work stressed the doctrine of the royal supremacy in all matters ecclesiastical and would appear to have been the work of a Doctor Richard Mockett, an Oxford divine who, by reason of similar writings in which he ventilated the King's right to override even ecclesiastical canons, had made himself very unpopular in the south.¹⁵⁵

The Scottish Church was now seriously perturbed and James in order to preserve a favourable atmosphere, wrote stating that he had no intention of forcing anything against common consent.¹⁵⁶ Any faint hopes which this letter may have raised were quickly dispelled during the early months of 1617. To accompany him north James chose the most notable exponents of ritualism in the Anglican church, Bishops/

153. 1b p237-8.

154. RPC (1st series) 10p521-2: 530-1: 534-8.

155. 1b pcviii - cix

156. 1b 11 p684-6.

Bishops Andrewes, Neile and Montague, and Neile's Chaplain, the anti-Calvinistic and Arminian Doctor William Laud. Meanwhile workmen were busy with various alterations and decorations in the Chapel Royal at Holyrood with a view to staging a full Anglican service in its most elaborate form and gilded figures of the Apostles and Evangelists made their appearance. This drew a remonstrance from the Scottish Bishops and the King withdrew the figures with the sarcastic remark that his English Bishops would be able to instruct them.¹⁵⁷

It must not be overlooked that the position of James as Supreme Head of Church and State in England had become increasingly difficult in recent years. The King had no quarrel with Calvinist Theology which was strongly held in the established church, but he was faced with a growing body of nonconformists in sympathy with Scottish Presbyterian principles, who with a potent motive for self-assertion were challenging the Royal prerogative in Parliament over vital questions^{of} procedure, taxation and supply.¹⁵⁸ The situation in the two Kingdoms interacted and if he could bring the Scots kirk into conformity with the standards of the Anglican Church as by law established, the royal prerogative would gain in prestige and power.

James duly arrived in Scotland in May and there followed in the Chapel-Royal a service after the English fashion with the use of the surplice - a habit unknown in the kirk - while communion was received kneeling.¹⁵⁹ During the ensuing Parliament which was notable chiefly/

157. Spottiswoode 3 p238-9: Calderwood 7 p244.

158. Prothero: Statutes and Constitutional Documents 1558-1625 pxxxv, liiif, passim.

159 Calderwood 7 p246-7.

chiefly on account of its ecclesiastical measures, the Lords of the Articles were again chosen "as the King and the Bishops would have¹⁶⁰ them" while James personally supervised their drafting of the Acts. Care was taken to give the kirk the semblance of a voice in the appointment of its Bishops - there had from time to time been murmurings against the overriding of the restrictions imposed by the Montrose Assembly of 1600 and at the same time bring procedure into conformity with that pertaining in England. In order to make possible formal chapter election in all the dioceses in the Crown appointment of Bishops, cathedral chapters were restored and given their former manse, glebes, rents and other patrimonies, excepting conveyances lawfully made, and these were surrendered in so far as they remained¹⁶¹ with the Crown. An Act was also framed and duly passed appointing a board of commissioners for the plantation of kirks and the augmentation of stipends with powers to assign a perpetual stipend payable locally out of the t¹⁶²ems of every parish and to bring all t¹⁶²em owners clergy excepted, under contribution to the church. This commission which was under the chairmanship of Archbishop Spottiswoode virtually put stipend payments under the control of the Bishops and was established at this juncture by James out of no altruistic motives but as a gadget which he could use to bring the clergy to his frame of mind.

The one obstacle which the King had to fear was a General Assembly and/

160. *ib* p250.

161. AP. 4 529.

162. *ib* 531.

and he fell back upon the old device of a consultative council of clergy, inducing the Lords of the Articles to agree to an Act: "That what soever His Majesty should determine in the external government of the church with the advice of the Archbishops, Bishops and a competent number of the ministry should have the strength of a law". The words "and a competent number of the ministry" were only inserted at the earnest request of the Bishops who had no wish to forfeit their spiritual influence as the subservient instruments of a royal Pope while they could manipulate a conference of clergy either to gratify or temporize with the King. There were many protests and James, bent upon securing consent to his five articles of conformity, reluctantly withdrew the Act "as a thing no way necessary, the prerogative of his Crown¹⁶³ bearing him to more than was declared by it."

The most forceful protest was one drawn up by Hewat, Struthers and the historian David Calderwood, which was widely subscribed. It pointed out that the kirk had several Acts of Parliament on its side; was of a pattern nearest to the Apostolic original and that the proposed statute was a violation of the fundamental rule of the kirk that all changes in ecclesiastical law should be by the advice and determination of the assemblies of the church.¹⁶⁴ While James withdrew/

163. Spottiswoode 3 p241-5.

164. 1b p242-4.

withdrew the proposal he could not afford to neglect this challenge to his supremacy and he took action against the offenders through the High Commission which in 1615 had been merged into a single court under the presidency of the Archbishop of St. Andrews with wider and more closely defined powers.¹⁶⁵ Hewat was deprived and as he was convener of the liturgical committee it meant shelving the production of a form of divine service. Calderwood who was extremely provocative¹⁶⁶ was warded pending His Majesty's pleasure.

This was the occasion of Patrick Forbes's intervention in the affairs of the historian which Wodrow declares to be the cause of the antipathy and bias which Calderwood afterwards displayed towards him.¹⁶⁷ While Calderwood was in confinement Forbes visited him with a view to getting him to withdraw his protest and so save himself, pointing out that he could "obey any unjust sentence though you acknowledge it not". This attempt at conciliation was at the time bitterly resented by the prisoner who remained unmoved and was consequently in due course,¹⁶⁸ banished the realm. The bitterness of Calderwood and the hopes of a speedy liberty which he received if only he would yield justify the suggestion of Wodrow that Forbes was specially entrusted with this mission by the Bishops who stood for a policy of moderation and conciliation.¹⁶⁹

James was set upon having his way and before long he summoned just such a meeting as the waived statute had contemplated. On Sunday/

165. RPC (1st series) 10 p435-437 (n)

166. Spottiswoode 3 p247.

167. Wodrow: op cit p88:cf Calderwood 7 p296.

168. Calderwood 7 259f.

169. Wodrow: op cit p87.

Sunday 13th July a conclave of about thirty-six clergy together with the Archbishops and Bishops met at St. Andrews to discuss the five articles.¹⁷⁰ After a lengthy debate it was decided to defer the question of their acceptance to a General Assembly - a decision which His Majesty reluctantly adopted. And when Spottiswoode would not guarantee the issue James threatened that if the articles failed to pass he would use his authority to establish them to such good effect that "they shall call me a tyrant and persecutor".¹⁷¹ It was thought advisable to let the October Synods pass when the Bishops could sound the clergy and the members who were to attend the Assembly might be selected. The Bishops reported favourably on the possibilities and an Assembly was duly called for St. Andrews in November on the shortest possible notice.¹⁷² The Assembly, Episcopalian in tone and with Spottiswoode in the chair, failed lamentably to achieve the purpose for which it had been called. Pretexts were easily found for postponing consideration of three of the articles¹⁷³ while the Assembly went as near to the rejection of the remaining two as it dared - private communion was to be permissible only on oath to those who were critically ill and with conditions attached which rendered it no longer private and reverence at communion was to be inculcated not by kneeling but by the minister giving the elements with his own hands and repeating appropriate words.¹⁷⁴

The King was intensely annoyed and wrote to the Scottish Archbishops in stinging terms ordering them "to keep Christmas Day precisely/

- 170. Spottiswoode 3 p246.
- 171. lb p247.
- 172. RPC (1st series) 11 p253-4.
- 173. BUK p1141-2.
- 174. lb p1140-1.

ly" and to withhold stipend from all ministers who would not support the five articles adding that "since your Scottish Church hath so far contemned my clemency, they shall now find what it is to draw the anger of a King upon them".¹⁷⁵

Spottiswoode accordingly turned his sermon at Edinburgh on Christmas Day into a defence of festival days and His Majesty's ecclesiastical policy, while Couper in Holyrood Chapel took good care to see that the service there should be pleasingly ornate.¹⁷⁶

The year 1617 closed for the kirk as it had opened - full of forebodings and misgivings. Meanwhile in December, Alexander Forbes had died and the Bishopric of Aberdeen was ~~again~~ vacant¹⁷⁷ for the second time within two years.

175. Botfield:op cit 2 p524,525: Spottiswoode 3 p249-250.

176. Calderwood 7 p288.

177. 1b p287:Keith: Catalogue of Scottish Bishops p217.

1618: Elevation ~~to~~ the See of Aberdeen

In November 1617 the Provost and Baillies of Edinburgh had written to King James asking for the second time ~~of~~ Patrick Forbes might be appointed one of their ministers. They described him as "a learned pastor, well-known to your Majesty and approved by the reverend prelates of our church for his rare gift of preaching,¹ his peaceable and unspotted life and conformity in all points". The request was not granted. Alexander Forbes was at this time definitely in failing health² and it seems probable that the King and the Scottish Bishops had the Laird of Corse already in the forefront of their minds for the impending vacancy. On 27th January 1618 James formally notified the Scottish prelates that he had made choice of Patrick Forbes for the vacant See of Aberdeen being persuaded "as well of the learning, gravity, wisdom and true godliness of Patrick Forbes of Corse enabling him duly to exercise and discharge the calling of a Bishop, as of the great and earnest desire of our best affected subjects of that Diocese to have him established their Ordinary as well witnessed by their expression thereof at the last vacancy of the said See".³ Guthrie in his Memoirs says that whenever a vacancy occurred in a Bishopric it was the custom of King James VI to ~~request~~ the Archbishop of St. Andrews to convene the other Bishops and for them to suggest three or four names/

1. Botfield:op cit 2 p518.

2. Calderwood 7 p284.

3. Funerals pl93-201:Botfield:op cit 2 p542-3.

names out of which the King chose one and mentions Forbes as one of the Bishops who were appointed in this way.⁴ In a letter written to his friend Mitchell of Udney on 12th March 1618 Forbes spoke of the burden which the Bishops "had moved His Majesty to lay upon me"⁵ There can be no doubt that when the See of Aberdeen fell vacant at the end of 1617 the Scottish Bishops impressed the claims of Patrick Forbes upon His Majesty.

Apart from the attractiveness of his personality and the soundness of the appointment because of his ability and learning, the elevation of Forbes to the Scottish Episcopate at this time was a shrewd move on the part of the King and his advisers. Several of the Bishops were regarded as upstarts by the powerful nobility, because while of inferior birth, they shared with them, in virtue of their office, the government of the realm.⁶ The appointment of Patrick Forbes was conciliatory at a time when the King was seeking the support of the nobility for his five articles of religion. At the same time the elevation of a man who had sat at the feet of Melville and who now stood midway between the extremists on either side - one who was a moderate - might go far towards inspiring confidence amongst all sections of kirkmen in the King's ecclesiastical policy. Further by establishing the Anglican 'via media' in Scotland, James hoped to win into the kirk many adherents of Rome,⁷ and there could hardly/

4. Guthrie: Memoirs pl6.

5. Botfield: op cit 2 p551-3.

6. cf Chapter 111.

7. Calderwood 7 p312, 508: Lawson The Episcopal Church in Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution p413.

hardly have been a better nomination to a diocese which was a hot-bed of Romanism, than one whose writings had laid bare the falsity of Papalist claims and appealed with a spirit of reasonable persuasion for conversion to Protestantism.

On being informed of the King's choice for the See of Aberdeen the Archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow and such Bishops as were in Edinburgh at the time wrote to Forbes of "the joy of our hearts" chiefly because "we foresee the great profit that is to be redound to the church of God by this your appointment". Their one fear seemed to be lest he should decline the office and they added: "We are assured if any man did ever come to his place by God's calling you are he" and went on to remind him of the wish of all within the diocese at the time of the last vacancy. This letter was despatched to Forbes on 5th February and with it the Bishops enclosed the King's letter of 27th January.

The reply which Forbes sent to this letter has been severely criticised. Scot declares that he "conveyed his answer... after such form that the Bishops might easily know that he would accept the Bishopric nolens, volens; nay further, he insinuated that his acceptance would grace the office..... He pretended that he would not enter but upon such and such conditions: yet he entered by the election of a Chapter not swearing to the caveats as others had done before him..."⁹ Calderwood writes in the same vein and maintains/

8. Funerals p202:Botfield:op cit 2 p542-5.

9. Scot: Apologetical Narration p254.

tains that Forbes's reply was presumptuous and that he worded his letter so craftily that while appearing to shrink from the episcopal office, the Bishops could easily see that he would be readily persuaded to accept it.¹⁰ Row also asserts that he was only too willing to grasp at the preferment.¹¹ All three historians proceed to allege love of position and a desire to repair the broken lairdship of Corse as the carefully veiled motives for the acceptance of the See.^{12.}

The accusation about the broken lairdship was utterly false¹³ and Wodrow who was no respecter of Bishops¹⁴ frankly suggests that Calderwood was biassed¹⁵ and pointed out that the Bishops by reason of their letter freed Forbes from having any share in seeking after the preferment.¹⁶ Scot, Calderwood and Row belonged to the extreme Presbyterian sect and their remarks about the Bishops and those who did not see eye to eye with themselves in matters of religion are so blatantly scurrilous¹⁷ that we need not seriously consider their allegations. To give brief instances: Row brands Archbishop Gladstones - a harmless prelate of middling ability - "a vile, filthy, belly-god beast ... Let that perjured apostate's filthy memory stink, rot, perish", while Calderwood alludes to Spottiswoode/

10. Calderwood 7 p296.

11. Row p260.

12. Scot: op cit p254: Calderwood 7 p296: Row p260.

13. cf Chapter 1.

14. cf Wodrow: The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland: passion.

15. cf. Chapter 111.

16 Wodrow Biographical Collections p88.

17. Row p259-260, 291, 292-3, 304: Calderwood 4p49f; 61-2, 503: 7p350 395: Scot: op cit p238, 240, 299f.

72.

Spottiswoode as "a profane villain with an impudent face and a cauterised conscience, a traitor, profane and licentious" and describes Bishop Cowper's noble and restrained sermon on the five articles as so impertinent and frivolous "that the meanest in judgment made a mock at him".^{18.}

The letter in question which Forbes sent to Archbishop Spottiswoode on 13th February¹⁹ does not read like a piece of extensive and intricate hypocrisy. It is straightforward, clear and modest and a single motive is obvious throughout - a deep desire to take the course which, in the circumstances of the time, would best allow him to serve the church. Because of "divers respectful considerations" it had taken Patrick Forbes several years to bring himself to accept ordination²⁰ and to hesitate over a Bishopric at such a critical and unsettled time for the church need surely occasion no suspicion as to motive. The considerations which Forbes now had to ponder were even more weighty than those which confronted his conscience in the years previous to his entry into the ministry. By accepting a Bishopric he would stand to forfeit the respect of - and therefore his influence with - many who at present had regard for him. On the other hand to refuse would be to forfeit the trust and favour of the King and the regard of all those who pressed his promotion, with the inevitable result that his ministry would be immeasurably weakened.

18. Calderwood 7 p342.

19. Wodrow op cit p88: Botfield: op cit 2p545: Funerals p.1v.

20. cf Chapter 111.

ed.

"..... Neither can my refusing of so undeserved, unsought for and unexpected favour but draw upon me the imputation of inexcusable misregard. If I be not mistaken in the reason of my hesitation wherein I am so far from disallowing the office and degree of a Bishop, that they being rightly defined with such moderation of place and power as may put restraint to excessive usurpation and practicing accordingly, I think it not only a tolerable but even a laudable and expedient policy in the church and very well consisting with God's written word, the only rule whereunto all the affairs of his house should be levelled for currying the applause of men or for inviting of manifold misconstructions and misdeemings I would earnestly decline the calling. I know very well how great a sin it is to offend one of the least ones that believeth in Christ. But with that I know also that he is a man of very weak and unstayed conscience who is either so tickled with popular applause as to be carried by a guess to a thing without light, thus to strengthen a common giddiness, or is so terrified with his own misconstructions as therefore to omit any duty which the honour of God or good of his church requireth of him. I know we must walk through good report and evil report and he is a very unfit man for a good purpose either in church or state 'qui ponit rumores ante salutem.....'

If I durst choose my own course I had rather have a cottage in some wilderness, wherein to drive out the remainder of my days, than to be brought any more into the view of the world and in the mouthes/

mouthes of men. And if I were so vain as to be set for honour, ease or commodity: yet alas! What honour could I look for by accepting a Bishopric whereby the minds of men who now both honour and reverence me above either my place or merit, shall be turned to account me a ~~corrupt~~ man and ambitious usurper..."

Yet to refuse would be to incur the royal displeasure "which is the rock under Christ I am loathest to strike on, or then to drive both myself and my ministry in such common distrust as I see not how henceforth it can be any more ²¹fruitful".

The circumstances of the time made the decision doubly difficult. The King had not long issued a Proclamation requiring observance of the major holy days ²² and a royal letter had reached the Privy Council ordering arrestment of stipend in the case of clergy ²³ who would not support the five articles. The kirk was in a state of apprehension lest James should proceed to enforce the articles on his sole authority. The Bishops had already strongly advised against the withholding of stipend and had undertaken to try and persuade their clergy to fall into line and to this end Spottiswood had convened a conference of Bishops and Clergy which met in Edinburgh on 29th January, the day after the reading of the Proclamation. But despite this, and the reading of the royal letter which/

21. Funerals plv - lviii:Botfield:op cit2p545f: Calderwood 7p291-6

22. RPC.(1st series) 11 p296-7:456.

23. ib p354-5

which threatenēd recalcitrant clergy with loss of stipend, the clergy would promise only to consult their brethren and "do what in them²⁴ lay to give the King satisfaction"

It was this state of affairs which added to Forbes's natural hesitancy in the matter of the Aberdeen Bishopric. At the conclusion of his letter of 13th February to Archbishop Spottiswoode he expressed the earnest hope that the King would enforce nothing upon the church, even where it was defective, without a free and national council and he continued:

" But if things be so violently carried as no end may appear of bitter contentions neither any place left to men placed in rooms, but instead of procuring peace and re-uniting of the hearts of the brethren to stir the coals of detestable debate, for me I have no courage to be a partner in that work. I wish my heart blood might extinguish the ingracious rising flame in our kirk. But if I can do nothing for the quenching of it, then I would be heartily sorry to add fuel thereto".²⁵

In the circumstances Forbes felt that he would not be justified in coming to a decision meantime and on the same day as he wrote accordingly to Archbishop Spottiswoode, we find him writing to his life-long/

24. Spottiswoode 3 p350-2; Calderwood 7 p289. Calderwood gives the date of the clerical conference as 26th January. Spottiswoode places it on 29th January. Spottiswoode who convened the meeting is the more likely to be correct.

25. Funerals plix-lx.

life-long friend, Rev. Thomas Mitchell, minister at Udney for his
 "counsel and prayers to God for direction" ²⁶ .

The Archbishop replied practically by return ²⁷ - an action which would seem to indicate how anxious he was that the nominee should accept the Bishopric. He began by informing Forbes that he had received the license from the King to the Dean and Chapter of Aberdeen empowering them to elect him and proceeding with gentle persuasion he asked that he consider "what the state of this time ²⁸ and the church of God in it, craveth at your hands". This letter with its reassurance that the Archbishop was "in expectation of a good peace", in conjunction with subsequent events, influenced Forbes in his acceptance of the See. Meanwhile it kept him from withdrawing his name and made him feel that he ought at least to await "the issue of God's working" ²⁹ - to see what feeling was evinced at his formal election which had been fixed for 24th March.

On that day the Dean and Chapter duly met and formally elected Patrick Forbes to the vacant See of Aberdeen. The Diocesan Synod immediately proceeded to address a letter to their Bishop-elect whom they described as their "loving brother and fellow-labourer in the Gospel". They reminded him how, when the See was last vacant "the/

26. ^{ib} p205:Botfield: ^{op} cit 2 p551-2. Botfield thinks the date of this letter may have been 18th February 1618.
 27. Funerals p205 Botfield: ^{op} cit 2 p551. Spottiswoode's letter is dated 16th February.
 28. Funerals p204-5:Botfield: ^{op} cit 2 p550-1.
 29. Funerals p206:Botfield ^{ib} p552-3.

"the greatest part both of preachers and professors of all degrees" supplicated for him to be their Bishop "as the fittest of all men for that seat" and now the Chapter having received the royal warrant "have all in one joyful voice made choice of you and have sent unto you some of their number³⁰ to acquaint you with their election and to require you in the name of God not to flee this His calling by their voices in a time of such evident necessity"

Once again the path of duty had at length been made unmistakably clear to Patrick Forbes and once again he walked along it and in due course was consecrated and enthroned as Bishop of Aberdeen.³¹ His election is quite unique in the annals of Scottish Episcopacy, if not indeed in the annals of the whole Anglican Communion. We might say that it is ^{the} only 'congé d'élire' election which also partook of the nature of an election 'per inspirationem',³² for all who had gathered for the election without debate or dissent, spontaneously and joyfully acclaimed the person whose name had been proposed to them. There was at this election a most unusual procedure: every Presbytery in the diocese sent commissioners to the election and these gave their consent and approval to the formal choice of the Chapter³³ — a course which could only have been taken because the choice happened to be an extremely popular one and there was the gravest/

30. Funerals p206-7:Botfield ib p553-4.

31. Funerals p206,215.

32. cf Dowden: The Mediaeval Church in Scotland p25.

33. Funerals p208:WodrowLop:cit p90.

gravest apprehension lest the Bishop-elect should refuse the office.

No one who has been at pains to trace the events leading up to the entry of Patrick Forbes into the Bishopric of Aberdeen could possibly attach any weight to the accusations of the Presbyterian historians. In the Folio of the 1678 edition of Calderwood's 'History of the Kirk of Scotland' ~~in the margin of the edition~~, on the margin opposite this historian's assertions against Forbes, in a hand which is almost certainly contemporary - or nearly contemporary - with the date of publication, are written these words: "Inverecunda censura de modesto et optimo viro" - a shameless censure upon a man of modesty and great worth.³⁴ It was the conclusion of Shand whose Biographical Memoir of the Bishop forms an invaluable introduction to the Spottiswoode Society's edition of the Funerals, that Forbes's letters "show distinctly that the mitre was not a subject of his solicitude",³⁵ While Doctor George Garden whose monumental edition of Doctor John Forbes's life and works is prefaced by an authoritative sketch of the Bishop's life, writing of the time when he came to the Bishopric said: "Non ille honores, honores illum prosequantur" -³⁶ He did not seek honours, they came to him.

The acceptance of the See of Aberdeen by Patrick Forbes gave general satisfaction throughout the entire church. On all sides his spiritual power was recognised and revered.³⁷ He had already proved himself/

34. Calderwood 1678 Edition, Edinburgh p695; ~~ary Edinburgh 1695.~~

35. Funerals plxvi.

36. Garden 8p3.

37. Melville: op cit pl8; Wodrow: op cit p80, 88; Burnet: Life of Bedell.
(Preface) Funerals pl3-16, 74, 75, 161, 166, 297.

himself a capable defender of the reformed faith and order. Connected by the accidents of birth with many well-known families he would be able to make his good influence effective in the higher councils of church and state.³⁸ In a troubled time he had shown his willingness to act as a mediator and to compose differences which vexed the kirk. His preaching was powerful and persuasive having in it a sweet insinuation of grace.³⁹ His experience of university administration under Andrew Melville and his careful management of his own estates, marked him out as the one under God who could best administer the University and Diocese of Aberdeen.⁴⁰ And being at heart a man of peace, yet able if need be to stand firm,⁴¹ he seemed the very man for the times - in every way the man to occupy the throne which had once been Elphinstone's and to bring to that noble prelate's See, an even greater glory. There was indeed some opposition to his advancement as he had anticipated there would be, but it came from an extreme Puritan section of the ecclesiastical community and was vague and of little weight or consequence.^{42.}

The election of Patrick Forbes to the Bishopric of Aberdeen was the first to take place under the Act of 1617 which marked the successful culmination of the King's ecclesiastical policy in one of its spheres/

38. cf Chapters 1 and 111

39. Funerals pl63: The House of Forbes p316 (quotation).

40. Garden § 4 pl-2. § 10, 11 p3-4.

41 1b § 12fp4: Funerals plx: cf. Hubulus pl58: To a Recusant p30 and passion.

42. Botfield op.cit 2 p555.

spheres + the establishment of Crown appointed Bishops over the kirk. After the erection of Cathedral Chapters in the 12th and 13th centuries episcopal election lay as a rule with the Chapter presided over by the Dean. But first a license to elect had to be obtained from the King and his assent afterwards secured before the requisite Papal confirmation was sought. As the King could withhold license or assent at will he virtually controlled the election.⁴³ From the early 14th century however, the Popes began to provide to vacant Sees by plenitude of power and Chapter election became a mere formality. This development conflicted with the interest which the Crown naturally had in the appointment of Bishops who were lords of Council and Parliament.⁴⁴ Hence the famous Indult of 1487 whereby the Pope agreed to await the royal nomination for eight months whenever a bishopric or an abbacy exceeding 200 florins in value, fell vacant - a piece of collusion which had a financial as well as a political aspect.⁴⁵ The Crown now had the initiative and the Papacy the final disposition and when in 1560 the Scots Estates declared the authority of the Pope to be null and void full disposition rested with the Crown. This was the position which had already been reached and the King nominated to a vacant See by congé d'élire to its Dean and Chapter,⁴⁶ in Scotland there was no retention of Episcopacy as a system of church administration.⁴⁷

When/

43. Dowden: The Mediaeval Church in Scotland p45f:61, cf p23-38
44. Professor R.A. Hannay: The Scottish Crown and the Papacy 1424-1560 (Historical Association of Scotland 1931p4-7.)
45. ib p9-10.
46. cf Prothero: Statutes and Constitutional Documents p242-4.
47. cf Chapter 11.

When, at the Convention of leading clergy and laity held at Leith, in 1572, the kirk intimated its acceptance of Morton's scheme for a titular Episcopacy, it became necessary to define the mode of appointment to the Sees. The Convention while recognising the position of the Crown sought to give validity to the new Episcopacy by retaining the traditional forms employed in the creation of a Bishop. This had been the aim of the 'via media' reformers in England and the framers of the Leith Concordat simply adopted the Anglican formulae. Omitting the Papal authority, in effect these amounted to a retention of pre-Reformation practice, for they gave the Crown the initiative and the Chapter merely a formal voice in pronouncing the royal nominee qualified and continued the traditional rite of consecration.⁴⁸ Under the Leith agreement the precise procedure in the appointment of a Bishop was briefly as follows⁴⁹

1. The royal nomination and commendation to the Dean and Chapter of the vacant See.

2. The royal License to elect the Crown nominee.

3./

48. In Scotland however this remained merely a semblance until 1610 when three Scottish prelates received the laying-on of hands from English Bishops and returned to consecrate their brethren. From 1572-1610 there was no attempt to bestow the 'Apostolic Succession' upon the Scottish Bishops. The laying-on of hands was by ordinary ministers, Superintendents or Bishops who did not stand in an unbroken episcopal descent from the Apostles.

49. Calderwood 3 pl81-2: 184-5, B.U.K. 207-236. cf. Appendix VI.

3. Certification of the election under the common seal of the Chapter with request for the royal assent.
4. The Royal Assent and favour signified to the Archbishop with the order for the consecration of the Bishop-elect under the Great Seal.
5. The oath of homage to His Majesty by the new Bishop after consecration.
6. The restitution of temporalities to the new Bishop after his consecration and act of homage under the Privy Seal.

The controversy that arose over the Tulchan Episcopate made it impossible for the Crown to continue to apply the Leith formulae and when James VI embarked upon his policy of inducing the kirk to accept Bishops he had to submit to a procedure which gave the kirk a voice in their appointment and a control over their office. The King gradually circumvented these restrictions until episcopal appointments and functions were alike under his control.⁵⁰ There only remained to define and safeguard this phase of his policy by giving it statutory sanction. Such was the purpose of the Act of 1617 anent the election of Bishops which, in order to achieve the desired end, revived the procedure of 1572 and placed it in the statute book. This Act made only two technical divergencies from the Leith formulae, it required specific provision under the Great Seal after election for the spirituality and a Great Seal writ after consecration for the restitution of the temporalities instead of an order under the Privy Seal.^{51.}

The actual procedure under this important Act whereby a Presbyter was elevated to the rank of Bishop is well illustrated in the election of/

50. cf Chapter 111.

51. A.P. 4 p529.

of Patrick Forbes to Aberdeen. On 27th January 1618 the King notified Archbishop Spottiswoode and the Bishops of his Scottish province of his choice for Aberdeen.⁵² Early in February the royal nominee received from the Primate official notification of the royal will,⁵³ while the latter shortly received the King's License and recommendation to the Dean and Chapter of Aberdeen⁵⁴ empowering them to proceed to the election. The License and royal recommendation duly passed the Privy Seal and were then forwarded by the Archbishop to the Dean who convened the Chapter for election which took place on 24th March.⁵⁵ Presided over by the Dean, the Chapter made an unanimous choice.⁵⁶ The sending of commissioners by the Presbyteries of the Diocese in no way affected procedure under the Act of 1617 for these were present merely to express their approbation at the choice and it is worthy of note that the official Certification of the election as required by the Act was signed only by the Dean and Chapter.⁵⁷ Shortly after the election the Chapter's Certificate of Election was sent to the Scottish Primate who, upon receipt of it, on 29th March endorsed the election proceedings according to the form sent him by the royal Chaplain, the Dean of Winchester, and forwarded it to the King, petitioning the Royal Assent and the Royal Warrant for the consecration.⁵⁸ *the King's Patent to be Bishop of Aberdeen*⁵⁹ and on 26th April Spottiswoode got the Assent and the Mandate/

52. cf. supra.

53. cf. supra.

54. cf. supra.

55. Funerals p206. Botfield op cit 2 p550, 553.

56. Funerals p208.

57. ib p209.

58. Botfield op cit 2 p554-5.

59. Funerals p 211.

84. 60

Mandate authorising him to make arrangements for the consecration,
But before this could take place the royal Assent had to pass the
Great Seal and the⁶¹ royal Mandate the Privy Seal. The Archbishop
therefore fixed the consecration for 17th May at St. Andrews, invit-
ing the Bishops of Dunkeld and Brechin to assist him in the sacred
Act.⁶² After the consecration the new Bishop appeared before the
Notaries Public in his Cathedral and presented to them the Act of
Consecration and the Royal Patent to the Bishopric requiring the Archdeacon of
the said Cathedral to enthrone him.⁶³ This was forthwith done "by
delivery of the Word of God enclosed within a Bible" and he was duly
admitted into the temporalities of the See. These final formalities
took place on 26th May 1618.⁶⁴ It is interesting to note that in
the Royal Provision to the Bishopric, Forbes is regarded as success-
or of, and is identified with, the Bishops of the See of the pre-
Reformation succession.⁶⁵ This view of the episcopal office was
due to the Anglican consecrations of 1610 which restored the tra-
ditional Apostolic Succession to the Scottish Bishops and could
not have been applied to their predecessors who entered office in
1572 and the following years.

It will thus be seen that in Scotland during the period of the
first Episcopate formal election was merely an incident in the pro-
tracted/

60. 1b p214.
61. 1b. cf R.M.S. vii No.1816.
62. Funerals p214-6.
63. 1b p215.
64. 1b p215,216.
65. 1b p213.218(n).

tracted procedure of making a Bishop and that, consecration apart, it was almost entirely a matter pertaining to the King working through his Primate. That this was so had much to do with the failure of Episcopacy under Charles I., a monarch who dispensed his preferments at court. ⁶⁶ that his will might more readily be impressed upon church and state alike. And when after the Restoration ⁶⁷ in 1660. an identical mode of making Bishops was re-introduced, with the minor exception that one provision under the Great Seal included both spirituality and temporality, it was one of the underlying causes of the disestablishment of Episcopacy at the Revolution of 1688. No man can serve two masters and when policy conflicted the Bishops found themselves unable to take the popular side.

66. Guthrie: Memoirs pl6-17.

67. Wodrow: History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland l. p231 (n) 240, Lawson: The Episcopal Church in Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution 1/2 p742.

CHAPTER VPatrick Forbes and the Non-Conformists.

In the summer of 1618 during the first few months of Patrick Forbes's episcopate it did not seem beyond the bounds of ecclesiastical statesmanship to encompass the religious peace for which he had prayed. The observance of Good Friday and Easter Day had fallen far short of the King's requirements - a number of clergy conformed with the Bishops but only amongst the higher state officials does there appear to have been any effort to carry compliance to the extent of kneeling at Communion.¹ The Bishops, however, hoped to secure consent to the five articles in a General Assembly² and once these had received the impress of ecclesiastical authority they could be lawfully and tactfully urged until in time they came to be ^{the} accepted practice of the kirk. With the King in the position of clerical paymaster, the Bishops were able to keep the April Synods fairly quiet, whereupon James ordered ahead the work of the stipend commission and having considered a report from Spottiswoode which promised well, intimated a General Assembly for Perth on 25th August.⁴ The Commission had been careful to grant the laity compensation for stipend assessments and its abrupt ending with its task only half tackled, left them without a grievance to exploit and many of the clergy uncertain as to their/

1. Calderwood 7 p297-8.
2. Spottiswoode 3 p352.
3. R.P.C. (1st series) 11 p354,5
4. ~~1b~~ p419-420.

their financial future.⁵ The Assembly preliminaries were deftly managed by the King and Bishops as on former occasions so as to secure selected instead of elected delegates and James took care to nominate a fair number of lay members upon whose vote he felt he could rely.⁶

When the day for the Assembly arrived the task of delivering the opening addresses which sounded the note for subsequent proceedings - in the circumstances a doubly responsible task - devolved upon Bishop Patrick Forbes and Archbishop Spottiswoode.⁷ The Primate protested that the articles had been sent without his knowledge and that he would personally have declined them, not because he considered them unlawful but because he foresaw that they would lead to strife. They were the King's "own motions" and not being unscriptural ought to be accepted as such. While affirming that "the Kingdom of God consists not in them but in the righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost" he strenuously deprecated the attitude/ of those who "think they have religion enough when they have talked against Bishops and ceremonies".⁸ The Bishop of Aberdeen's opening/

5. Spottiswoode 3 p252; Calderwood 7 p302-4. Calderwood declares that the commission was only favourable to those clergy who were amenable to the five articles and that it did not make its decreets legally binding so that ministers would have to plead for their stipend augmentations.
6. RPC (1st series) 11 p431-4(n) cf. Chapter 111.
7. Lindsay: True Narrative of the Proceedings in the Perth Assembly p19, 21. BUK. p1143.
8. Lindsay ib p40, 45.

opening sermon which preceded that of the Archbishop was not reported, but we gather that he took a ~~s~~imilar line. His chief ~~argu~~ment would appear to have been that the articles were not contrary to the will of the Almighty King as revealed in Holy Scripture and in the practice of the historic church and they should not therefore be rejected because they came at the hands of an earthly King.⁹

Lord Binning wrote to His Majesty on 27th August praising this address and informing him that Forbes "with great dexterity propounded the weight of the purposes to be entreated and the necessity of consideration", stressing that if the church lost the royal favour at such a time the consequences might be grave.¹⁰ We do not know what part the new Bishop took in the subsequent discussion which was mostly in committee but Binning went on to name ^{him} ~~as~~ amongst "the worthiest instruments" in the launching of the articles.¹¹

Everything possible had been devised to ensure the acceptance of these five articles by the Assembly. The King made it known that if they were rejected he would enforce them on the strength of the prerogative; Spottiswoode occupied the moderator's chair and almost all the discussion was confined to a large privy conference of his own nomination, while when the time to vote arrived he summarily rejected a motion to take each article separately and instead put them/

9. 1b p19; Calderwood 7 p305.

10. Hailes:Memorials of the Reign of James VI., p87-8.

11. 1b p92.

them to the Assembly 'en bloc'. Of the thirty laymen voting only two were against, but no fewer than thirty-nine out of eighty five ministers recorded a negative vote - a significant and ominous minority.^{12.}

Prior to his acceptance of the Bishopric, Forbes had^{ex}pressed the conviction that religious differences should be settled in a free,¹³ uninfluenced national synod. The Assembly at Perth was anything but that and by urging consent to the disputed proposals he laid himself open to a charge of hypocrisy.^{14.} But if Forbes was an idealist he was also a realist. If the articles were rejected and the King attempted to enforce them on his own authority the position of the kirk would be very much worse. It could expect nothing at the King's hand in the matter of kirk and stipends, non-conformity would grow out of all bounds and the interruption of Romanism could scarcely be stemmed. The obvious line in the circumstances, was to secure an official consent and to work for an increasing conformity.

The opponents of the five articles attacked them as unscriptural and on that account contrary to the will of God. They ought not, therefore, to be imposed upon the consciences of men.¹⁵ They were/

12. Lindsay: op cit p46+72: BUK 1145f, 1165: Botfield: Original Letters 2 p573f. Calderwood 7 p304, 332, 333-6

13. Funerals plix: Forbes's letter of 16th February to Archbishop Spottiswoode. cf Chapter IV.

14. Calderwood 7 p296.

15. Calderwood 7 p328-9: Altare Damascenum p396-420: Gillespie: English-Ropish Ceremonies pt1:ii-iv:pt111:v,viii.

were regarded as "Babylonish trinkets" and were blamed for in-
 creasing dissension.¹⁶ Over three of the articles, however, there
 was little or no controversy.¹⁷ Sick Communion¹⁸ and Private Baptism
 were to be according to the Public Order of the kirk and being
 privileges there was no call to enforce them, while the Bishops¹⁹
 never practised Confirmation.¹⁹ The two controversial articles were
 those which enjoined the keeping of festival days and kneeling at
 the reception of the Holy Communion. The cleavage was sharpest
 over the latter.²⁰ It was customary in the kirk to kneel for prayer
 but never for communion²¹ The consecration prayer in the Book of
 Common Order had for a time been offered kneeling and Lindsay held
 that if kneeling were right here it was surely right at the recep-
 tion.²² But the dispute over the gesture revealed a difference
 of Eucharistic theory between the strictly orthodox and the more
 liberal/

16. Gillespie:op cit pt. 11:iii,iv-vii; pt. 1V:ix.

17. McMillan:Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church pl69:This meant that when Communion was taken to the sick the service would be the full service as printed in the Genevan Book of Common Order. The Sacrament was not to be reserved.

18. Lindsay:op cit^{An Answer to the Reasons} pl13 The Service at Private Baptism was to be the same as prescribed for Public Baptism. It was generally agreed that there should be teaching of the Word at Private Baptism. This satisfied strict Calvinistic theory in which the Word and the Sacraments went together.
 cf John Forbes:Irenicum(Aberdeen 1629)pl20. Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen p76-7,189-190. Lorimer:Early Days of St. Cuthbert's Church p93.

19. Gordon:History of Scots Affairs lp91.

20. Calderwood: 7p324.

21. Calderwood:Altare Damascenum p777-8,785.

22. Lindsay:op cit. ~~The Examination of the Oath Discussed~~ 1. p91.

liberal Calvinists within the kirk. The former held to the view expressed in the First Book of Discipline: that Our Lord deliberately sat at the Last Supper, that the ~~real presence lay in the worthy~~ communion was a thanksgiving and a meditation and that ~~receivers~~ that the kneeling implied adoration and was idolatrous. They regarded it as "the first of the fifteen ceremonies of the Mass".

Shortly after the Perth Assembly the Privy Council issued a Proclamation enjoining obedience to the five articles. The Scottish Bishops however had agreed upon a policy of moderation and the High Commission, except in the case of a few extremists like Richard Dickson of St. Cuthberts, Edinburgh, who refused to allow folk to kneel, contented itself with admonitions. In several congregations people left when requested to kneel for communion and pamphlets condemning the articles were circulating freely in Edinburgh and Fife. The upshot was a new Proclamation enjoining universal obedience, an order for reconstituting the Court of High Commission with wider powers, and a letter from His Majesty to the Bishops pressing them to depose nonconformists without respect of persons or regard for numbers, and promising to fill the vacancies with ministers out of England.

There was a fair measure of conformity and provided the King did not intervene, the Bishops felt they might establish a 'via media' kirk on the basis of the articles. Accordingly in November 1619/

23. Knox 2 p187:Calderwood:Altare Damascenum p417:Gillespie op.cit pt111:ii-iv, pt1V:iv-viii:Rutherford Letters Bonar edition 1894 p193-4.
24. Calderwood 7 p480.
25. RPC (1st series) 11 p454-6
26. Calderwood 7p353.
27. Calderwood 1b passim:Row p349-350:RPC (1st series)11 p516-7..
28. RPC (1st series) 11 p579-581.
29. 1b p605(n).
30. Calderwood 7 p397.
31. cf Appendix VII.

1619 Archbishop Spottiswoode called a conference of Bishops and clergy for St. Andrews " to advise the best course ~~for~~ the peace of the kirk which was disturbed with a dangerous contention". The Archbishop called upon Patrick Forbes to state his views first probably in order to give the conference a good start. The Bishop divided his speech into three parts: Cause, Danger and Remedy. In dealing with the cause of the troubles he divided the blame between those who had practised the articles before the church had accepted them and those who, when the church had accepted them, chose to ignore its decision. He emphasised his own wish that they might not have been introduced "yet seeing in their nature they are indifferent and the King whose authority requires them hath also gotten an act of kirk on his side, I think it reason he should be obeyed. And if there were nothing further ^{that} than _^ the Assembly of the kirk decreed them, it is sufficient to move obedience to any reasonable person. The next is the danger which is great according to the number of persons to be considered in our kirk, for there are some atheists, some Papists, some weaker professors... The last danger is in respect of weak ones, who seeing such a distraction of opinion and contrariness among ministers, doubt of all religion and cannot tell what side to take them to. The remedy in my judgement is to submit peaceably to His Majesty's desire since the things are indifferent"³²

The/

The Bishops all concurred in this view and amongst the various expressions of opinion, arguments and appeals which the articles evoked there was not a wiser nor more Christian pronouncement. In subsequent discussions Bishop Forbes stands clearly before us as a mid-man and indeed as the outstanding protagonist of mediation and conciliation. Several of the ministers at the conference thought differently from the Bishops and were hesitant about stating their views, whereupon Forbes wisely suggested that the debate be submitted to seven from each side. Spottiswoode agreed and made ready to nominate for both parties, but Forbes asked him to allow the other side to appoint their own representatives.³³ We note too, that when one of the dissenting clergy felt he would be unable to attend the meeting, it was the Bishop of Aberdeen whom he approached with a view to seeking toleration at the hands of the King.³⁴ The conference was abortive and when Lord Scone, on behalf of the King pressed the Bishops for definite action in the matter of the articles, it was Forbes who went with the Primate to remonstrate with him in the hope of preventing any show of anger on the part of His Majesty.³⁵

At this time Spottiswoode had a letter from James ordering him to deprive a Mr. David Forrester if he would not give a definite reply as to whether he would conform. This Forrester felt he could/

33. **ib** p402.

34. **ib** p402-3.

35. **ib** p405-7.

could not immediately do. Forbes then offered to take the responsibility out of the Archbishop's hands and see if he could save for the kirk one of its most promising clergy: "My Lord, I pray you give me leave to do that which if it fail me, will do me harm. I will take his deposition out of your Lordship's hands into mine own; for this I must needs say though he be not yet fully resolved, yet he is somewhat more tractable than when he first came to us. And though he stand on his own conscience as every good Christian should do, yet he is also modest and subject ~~to~~ ³⁶ to hear reason as the youngest scholar in Scotland". ~~In~~

In the course of a further discussion it was forcibly urged upon the Primate that it might be worth while for the King to have the advice of other reformed churches before pressing the articles to extremity and that deposed ministers would merely give Scotland a bad name abroad. Spottiswoode allowed himself to get thoroughly roused and became sarcastic. The Archbishop had just made an un-called for reference to tittle-tattle at a recent clerical party, when Patrick Forbes in an attempt to salvage the meeting interrupted him with an appeal to be patient and a reminder that "passion never did good in these matters". ³⁷ These incidents reveal Forbes as a man who sought peace and who realised the futility of compulsion. So widely was he respected that his brother Bishops thought him the fittest among them "to step in sometimes as a mid-man that they might/

36. 1b p407-8. cf *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae* 1p 154f.

37. RPC(1st series) 12p126(n).

might draw the non-conformists to yield somewhat".³⁸

Here we may briefly note subsequent developments in relation to the five articles. In 1620 the High Commission was duly re-constituted³⁹ and the following year the articles received Parliamentary ratification.⁴⁰ James now reminded the Scottish Bishops that a sword had⁴¹ been put into their hands and warned them not to let it rust. The Bishops however pursued their policy of moderation bringing only the worst non-conformists before the High Commission⁴² and agreeing in conference that no minister should be urged with obedience to the articles.⁴³ They were concerned for the most part to check militant Puritanism on the one side⁴⁴ and aggressive Romanism on the other.⁴⁵ Hopes of a 'via media' worship grew less with the passing years. Over the length and breadth of the country no substantial measure of conformity was gained and when in 1626 Charles I granted a partial toleration,⁴⁶ it amounted to a little more than a gesture calculated to

38. Calderwood 7 p408.

39. Row p268f.

40. Calderwood 7 p491, 496f: Row p328-331. The Articles were presented to Parliament 'en bloc' and the members were forbidden to give a reasoned vote and were required simply to say 'Agree' or 'Disagree'. The voting was 86 in favour and 59 against. Calderwood asserts that the measures only passed because voting by proxy was allowed. It should be noted that such voting was already recognised and that a scrutiny of the record of this ratification shows that the proxy system made no difference to the result.

41. Calderwood 7 p508. 42. *ib* p412, 414f, 442 etc.

43. *ib* p571.

44. *ib* p358, 359, 447-8, 453, 603-4: RPC (1st series) 13 p520 etc.

45. *ib* p522-3, 571: *ib* 12 plxxxii, 395: 13p20(n) 541, 572.

46. Balfour: Annals 2 pl42-3. Charles I instructed his Scottish Bishops to allow ministers who had been admitted to the church before the Assembly of 1618 to forbear conforming to the five articles provided they did not speak against them or refuse the Sacrament to any who desired to partake kneeling. Banished, imprisoned or suspended clergy were to be restored on the same conditions but all who had entered the ministry since the Perth Assembly were to observe the articles.

98.
47

to stimulate the goodwill of the kirk for his land reforms. After 1626 the controversy over the five articles smouldered on until such time as the royal prerogative made a simultaneous incursion into the civil and ecclesiastical spheres when most significantly it was again fanned into flame.

48

As the hope of conformity faded in the face of extremist opposition and moderate doubt, the problem for ecclesiastical statesmanship was to prevent schism on a wide scale. Bishop Patrick Forbes was early alive to the danger and we can trace a distinct stiffening in his attitude towards non-conformity. In November 1620 while preaching in the Little Kirk of Edinburgh to urge support for the Elector Palatine in his struggle with the Catholic powers on the Continent, he digressed in order to administer a strong rebuke to the non-conformists. He branded them as "contentious troublers of the peace and unity of the kirk" and likened them to "the salamander that delighted to live in the fire; because there were matters brought into the kirk which were disputable⁴⁹ they would break the peace of the kirk and set all on fire" In the Parliament of 1621 he expressed great/

47. cf later.

48. Gillespie's 'English-Popish Ceremonies' and Calderwood's 'Re-Examination of the Perth Articles' were both published in 1636 when Charles I was using the royal prerogative to force a new Code of Canons and a new Prayer Book upon the kirk. The King had already offended the nobility by forcing through Parliament measures of land and timid reform and by increasing taxation and the power of the Bishops in the councils of state.

49 Calderwood 7 p453; Wodrow: op. cit p92.

great disappointment that the Lords of the Articles were not unanimous in sending the Perth measures forward for Parliamentary ratification..."Seeing His Majesty will have them brought in I protest upon my salvation and condemnation there is no danger in using them They are indifferent in themselves and therefore whosoever refuses to give His Majesty obedience in using them are contentious and troublers of the peace and unity of the kirk and therefore worthy to be punished.⁵⁰ When in the face of persistent opposition the Bishops agreed to petition the King in favour of toleration, Forbes alone stood out against such concession being extended to those who spoke of kneeling at communion as idolatry:"And will you ... justify the doctrine of these men who have called the reverend gesture which we use 'idolatry' and raised such a schism in our church? Till they be brought publicly to confess their error, or heresy rather, I shall never be yielding for my part. It was before indifferent, now I esteem it necessary in regard of the false opinions they have dispersed to retain constantly the form we have received".⁵¹ In his October Synod of 1627 the Bishop is reported to have taken an even stronger line and to have informed his clergy that he would make the best of them conform and "would have all counted schismatics that will not communicate at communion celebrate after the new form; and to be excommunicate as heretics that maintain/

50. 1b p491. In the Articles only four lay members refused to agree to the ratification of the five Articles of Perth. All the Bishops voted for the ratification in the Full Parliament.

cf Calderwood 7 p498:Scot:Apologetical Narration p294.

51. Funerals p217:Garden § 14 p5.

tain that kneeling in the act of receiving sacramental elements of bread and wine is idolatry"⁵² It seems likely, however, that ^{here} what was a strong plea has been misreported to appear as an open threat and certainly the words do not appear to have been followed by any such drastic action. Only once, in 1622, when action was being taken against two of the most troublesomenon-conformists do we find Patrick Forbes occupying his place in the Court of High Commission,⁵³ while such records as we possess of him as a Diocesan reveal a pastoral Bishop set upon conciliation and slow to take extreme action in cases of religious disobedience.⁵⁴ The writing of the Irenicum which Doctor John Forbes published in 1629, was largely due to the Bishops' desire to secure a peaceable unity by way of conviction.⁵⁵ Wodrow's accusation that Bishop Forbes "grew⁵⁶ more severe upon the ministers the longer he continued in office" cannot be accepted if it was intended to refer to actions as distinct from pronouncements.

In the Diocese of Aberdeen during the episcopate of Patrick Forbes the disputed points of the Perth Articles appear to have been ~~widely~~ observed. It was evidently the custom to receive communion kneeling. Writing of the Sacraments as administered by the Covenanting minister Andrew Cant in 1642, Spalding particularly/

52. Calderwood 7 p296:Wodrow op. cit p88-89.

53. RPC (1st series) 12 p627(n).

54. Selections from the Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen p89f; Garden § 13 p4, § 14 p5:RPC(2nd series) 3, passim.

55 J. Forbes:Irenicum. Title Page and Dedication

56. Wodrow:op. cit p92.

larly noted that the communicants were not kneeling "as was used before whereat sundry people murmured and grudged but could not mend it".⁵⁷ In the Session Records of St. Nicholas Aberdeen we find the following interesting references:⁵⁸ 25th July 1630. Received by the collector 35/- at Alex Hill's wife, her communion, 11th December 1630. Collected at the Private Communion administered to Marion Beanes, eight pounds. 3rd November 1633. Nine shillings given by John Touch at the receiving of the Lord's Supper.

These entries coincide with the dates of the public celebrations in the church but there is nothing to show whether they represent full celebrations according to the public rite in the homes of the sick or whether the Reserved Sacrament was administered. The relevant Perth Article required the full celebration to be taken when communion was private⁵⁹ and it is probable that this was what was done. The point is that here we have clear instances of Private Communion being administered in Aberdeen in the time of Bishop Forbes. We learn also that Good Friday, Easter Day and Whitsunday were appropriately recognised during the Bishop's term of office. Spalding complained in 1639 that in Aberdeen there "was no preaching or communion as was usit and wont" on Good Friday while/

57. Spalding: Memorials of the Troubles 2 p185.

58. Eeles: Traditional Customs p86-7 quoted McMillan: Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church p211.

59. Lindsay: op cit - ~~Ans.~~ Answers to the Reasons p119.

60. Spalding op cit 1 p261.

while from the same author we gather that communion⁶¹ was customary in the Diocese at Easter and Whitsunday.

Indeed there cannot have been many recalcitrant clergy in the neighbourhood of Aberdeen where the intellectual brilliance and the spiritual force of the Aberdeen Doctors, under the leadership⁶² of Doctor John Forbes, held sway. In his 'Irenicum' John Forbes strenuously contended that the articles were in conformity with God's will as revealed in the historic church; they embodied nothing that was contrary to Holy Scripture and their substance was primitive and traditional in ecclesiastical practice. Yet since their content was not definitely enjoined in the New Testament, in themselves they could properly be regarded as "things indifferent".⁶³ To Doctor John Forbes the Holy Communion was much more than a meditation: it was a eucharist, a thanksgiving, a source of inspiration, a service in which Christ as Saviour is to be adored and therefore the humble posture of kneeling was only fitting.⁶⁴ The 'Irenicum' defended festival days as keeping before us "the capital events of the Creed", as not prohibited by Scripture, and declared that wantonly to select other special days amounted to arrogance, if not to superstition. It pointed out that Confirmation was instituted by the Apostles/

61 ib. p172.

62. cf. Chapter VI. The Answers of some brethren of the ministrie to the Replies (1638) p25: Spalding op.cit 2p185 etc.

63. J. Forbes: *Irenicum* 1. Chapter VII. p52.

64 ib. 14, 55-6.

Apostles and was inserted in many of the catechetical summaries of the ancient church and upheld Private Baptism ~~from~~ the text "Go teach.... and baptise": where there is the right to teach there is the right to baptise.⁶⁵ The author went on to stress that reason and faith may govern an 'indifferent' act to make it advisable without making it 'necessary'.⁶⁶ and pleaded with all lovers of Christ's truth and peace to realise what the minority have done in disturbing his unity - by schism, rebellion and false teaching.⁶⁷ He held as against the extremists that duty to the King was absolute except where the thing order is is shown to be contrary to God's Word and here he had Calvin, Knox and the early reformers on his side.⁶⁸ In maintaining that the King's powers are limited so that he cannot introduce innovations into a church 'proprio motu' the opponents of the articles admitted that a King could command a synod to take order about matters ecclesiastical and may then order ministers to observe its findings. Forbes claimed that this was precisely what James VI had done on the occasion of the Assembly at Perth.⁶⁹

The relations between Bishop Patrick and his son Doctor John whose studies he suggested and inspired,⁷⁰ were always harmonious and affectionate and we may take the 'Irenicum' as affording us a full exposition of the Bishop's own standpoint. Their views on 'indifferency'/'

65. 1b p55.

66. Irenicum (1629) p395: Selwyn: op cit: p59-65: The outlook of Forbes was similar to that of Hooker cf Ecclesiastical Polity BK V.

67. Selwyn: op cit p54.

68. Calvin. Institutes BK 1V xx32. Knox 2pl84:4p496-7: The First Book of Discipline informed the Lords of Parliament: "We will not bind your wisdoms to our judgement further than we be able to prove the same by God's plain Scriptures..."

69. Selwyn: op cit p37-43 cf Gillespie op.cit ptlll: pviii.

70. Garden § 23 p8: Burnet Life of Bedell (preface).

~~enough~~ and synodal consent appear as identical and without a doubt the father shared his son's lofty view of the Sacrament.⁷¹ He spoke of kneeling as a reverent gesture⁷² and on his death-bed requested the private administration of "the health-giving viaticum of the Holy Eucharist."⁷³ The attitude of Patrick Forbes towards externals in religion matured under the circumstances of the time into that of orthodox Anglicanism as expressed in the 1661-2 English Book of Common Prayer, Namely that rites and ceremonies were "things in their own nature indifferent ... and although the keeping or omitting of a ceremony in itself considered is but a small thing: yet the wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline is no small offence before God".⁷⁴ He was not set upon uniformity but upon unity. He stood for agreement "in all the substantial points of faith" but held that differences were allowable in non-fundamentals as they had been in the first centuries of the church.⁷⁵ He realised the value of externals while regarding joy and peace in the Holy Spirit as the essential of the Christian life.⁷⁶ He would have accepted the motto of Petrus Meiderlinus—a motto cherished by all true Christians - "In essentials unity, in nonessentials liberty, in all things charity"⁷⁷ It was the prime need for unity, itself the first essential in the church of his day, which impelled him to take the line that he did with regard to the Five Articles of Perth. The church/

John Forbes of Corse and his Eucharistic Teaching

71. For Dr. John Forbes's view of the Sacrament cf. Garden pp59, 147; Lou 174, 175, 197, 198 etc. London Quarterly Review (January 1929) pp45-6.

72. Funerals p217.

73. Garden 2 17 p6.

74. The Preface 1661-2 Book of Common Prayer.

75. A Defence of The Lawful Calling of Ministers of Reformed Churches p5.

76. Garden 2 14 p5.

77. Henderson: Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland p49.

church had accepted the articles as part of its common standard of worship, thereby taking authority over non-essentials and any rejection of that standard was a threat to essential Protestant unity.

While taking a definite^{and}/reasonable line against non-conformity of the Puritan type, as a Protestant Bishop, Forbes had to combat⁷⁸ the Romanist menace which was particularly strong in his diocese. Between 1618-1621 there was a wave of Romanist propaganda in the north which in a letter to King James the Bishop attributed to "our mad dissensions"⁷⁹ and together with his brother William of Craigievar he received instructions to enforce the Act of 1581 against Popish practices and to apprehend Jesuits and seminary priests throughout the diocese.⁸⁰ In 1623 while Prince Charles was at Madrid rumours of his proposed marriage to the Infanta, the daughter of a militant Romanist house, seriously perturbed Protestant Scotland and encouraged an outburst of Roman Catholic activity in and around Aberdeen.⁸¹ The match fell through, but Charles shortly married another Romanist, Henrietta Maria of France, and after his accession in 1625 when Catholicism abroad seemed in the ascendant Romanist hopes soared high at home and "chiefly they/grew to such a height of insolency in the north of Scotland that it was insupportable/

78. The Book of Bon Accord p229 cf Chapter 111.

79. Botfield:op. cit p635 cf RPC (1st series) 12 plxxii,395,633(n)

80. RPC(1st series) 12 p343,344.

81. 1b 13 p20(n) 541,572.

able in brawling the Bishop and inhabitants of Aberdeen with pasquils⁸² and libels ~~to~~ their faces, affixing them upon church porches".

Matters came to such a pass that the Bishop was forced to authorise the magistrates to search for Papist conventicles and to ward offenders and later to go further and to break into the homes of suspects.⁸³ It was the rising menace of Romanism in the North-East which, in 1627 evoked~~ed~~ the Bishop's last work, 'Eubulus', a well-reasoned and sharply pointed attack upon Roman Catholic principles and practices.⁸⁴ The following year Charles I was obliged to address a Proclamation to Bishops and ministers ordering them to mark down and send to the Privy Council twice yearly lists of all Papists who declined to attend the services of the established church. These were to be searched out, placed in safe custody, and on conviction, ex-communicated and forfeit.⁸⁵ But still there was no appreciable improvement in the situation in the north. In 1630 Popish conventicles were being frequently held in Aberdeen and "a number of invective and railing speeches were made against the professors of the true religion and ministers of the burgh of Aberdeen".⁸⁶

Romanism remained strongest in the north but its refusal to be uprooted all over Scotland caused the kirk the gravest concern. Writing of Scotland in^{the} 1630's the English historian Clarendon maintained that/

82. Blakhal: A Brieffe Narration pxxi(n).

83. RPC (2nd series) 2 p360-1, 375-6, 494, 509, 630-1. As a member of the Court of High Commission the Bishop had the authority to command the magistrates in respect of religious offenders. As a Privy Councillor he would have a similar authority in respect of civil offenders.

84. Eubulus: The Title Page and Preface (Raban 1627).

85. Blakhal: op. cit pxxli.

86. McLean: The Counter Reformation in Scotland p107, 109.

that the whole religion of that country consisted "in an entire detestation of Popery, in believing the Pope to be anti-Christ and hating perfectly the persons of Popists". It is essential to realise this if we are to understand developments which centred round the introduction of an advanced new Prayer Book in 1637. The opponents of the King on religious and other grounds deliberately fostered the dread of Romanism amongst the masses who were ill-informed regarding the contents of that work⁸⁷ and the Covenanted leaders very astutely made the King's Confession of 1581 denouncing all things Papish the⁸⁸ first of the three sections of⁸⁹ the National Covenant of 1638.

Bishop Patrick Forbes was compelled to treat the Romanist controversy, equally, if not more seriously, than he treated the Puritan controversy. Not only did the one re-act upon the other but the counter-Reformation had behind it a vast, powerful and insidious organisation and was particularly incursive in the north. Ross, one of the Aberdeen Doctors, declared that "almost here by his means he hath plucked up Popish superstition by the roots"⁹⁰ - an exaggerated statement which nevertheless indicates that the Bishop was alive to its dangers and exceedingly active in combating them. His method was one of wise discrimination and he tempered firm action with reasonable persuasion. Thus after the accession of Charles I when Romanism was particularly troublesome and arrogant he had no hesitation/

87. Clarendon: History of the Rebellion 2-3 6.

88. Spalding: op. cit 1 p274-284; Gordon: op. cit 1 p26-7; Balfour. Annals 2 p241.

89. Peterkin: Records of the Kirk p9-13.

90. Funerals pl88

tion in issuing stern orders to the magistrates and when that monarch proposed to grant the favour which his father had contemplated to the Leslies and to dispense with the hornings imposed upon them for Romanist activity, he strenuously opposed this course on the ground that indulgence in this case would encourage numerous other adherents of Rome.⁹¹ We find him exerting himself to remove children from the care of parents who were ardent Roman Catholics and placing them under Protestant tutors,⁹² while he issued precise orders to all his clergy to be diligent in bringing before the Session all who neglected sermons.⁹³

But Patrick Forbes was wise enough to see that the problem must be tackled at its roots and that persecution, apart from being unchristian, would be merely futile. It was this realisation which made the Bishop anxious to claim antiquity and the best of the Fathers of the early church for Protestantism. He had observed that the Romanists made numerous converts by claiming for their doctrine the support of the Fathers, while many Protestants disregarded altogether the voice of Christian antiquity as contrary to the Scriptures. This aspect of the need for sound teaching inspired his efforts to secure for King's College Aberdeen a Professor of Divinity who was to give careful instruction in ecclesiastical history.⁹⁴ The Bishop's own works were almost entirely devoted to combating Romanism. He described prayers/

91. RPC (2nd series) 2 p19,48.

92. ib 3 p246.

93. Selections from the Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen p92.

94. Garden § 21p7: 23p8: Grub 2 p373 cf later.

prayers to saints, the placing of relics under altars, and the "puddle of purgatory" as simply "Romish superstitions". He attacked the Roman clergy as ignorant and vicious and made plain his antipathy to their authority of tradition, apocryphal literature, canons, decretals and legends. He overthrew their doctrine of Papal supremacy, poured contempt upon their system of simony, indulgences, compulsory confession and masses for the dead and decried the use of holy water, the sign of the cross, pilgrimages and processions and the baptising of bells with a wit that would appeal to the multitude and a wisdom that would appeal to the educated.⁹⁵

But as with the Calvinist non-conformists wherever possible Patrick Forbes was tolerant towards the Papists. On one occasion early in his episcopate he required to be pressed before he would take drastic steps against them⁹⁶ and later he himself declared

"neither did I ever convene them (the priests) before either Privy Council or High Commission till their insolence had come to this height (masses and baptisms in open contempt of the church); now for the space of almost ten years I have borne up from that which easily in one year I might have achieved".⁹⁷ Forbes could upon occasions⁹⁸ suspend a horning where others would in all probability have given no quarter/

95. Henderson: Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland p46.

96. Botfield: op. cit 2 p830-1.

97. RPC (2nd series) 2 p49.

98. 1b 3 pl73-4.

quarter and although his denunciations were often strongly expressed there was nothing of the fanatic¹⁰⁰ about him. He was no Protestant Torquemada and his aim was to win rather than to force Papists to conformity. Once they showed signs of genuine conversion he was always ready to further their recognition as Protestants and to prevent possible persecution.⁹⁹

Such sparse allusions to Bishop Patrick Forbes as we possess in the ecclesiastical records of Aberdeen reveal an administrator in whom the quality of Christian forbearance was highly developed. He comes before us as a shepherd Bishop in whom there was no hasty, harsh or passionate action.¹⁰⁰ We discover him giving more time to one who had difficulties about the orthodox faith and only when he persistently refused to profess conformity did the Bishop exercise his episcopal authority and order him to leave the country under pain of the censures of the church.¹⁰¹ Under the date 25th August 1622 we read that sentence

of excommunication "against the rest was continued by advice of the Bishop to see if possible they could be won from their obstinance..."¹⁰²

In an age of intense religious rivalries vision was often narrow and the established order in church and state found itself face to face with a formidable challenge. In such circumstances religious toleration was inconceivable, many hardships were inflicted in the name of Christ/

99. cf 1b p334, 379-380 589: 4 p576-7.

100. Selections from Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen p89-90, 109.

101. 1b p91.

102 1b p109.

Christ and men of latitude were rare. Amongst such men, the fore-runners of a sublimer Christian era, because his authority was not despotic but was so largely one of influence, Bishop Patrick Forbes must take high rank.

Chapter VI.

Patrick Forbes and the Policy of Charles I.

As his episcopates advanced the peace which Forbes longed to see in the church grew more remote and when he died in 1635 events were moving steadily in the direction of a politico-religious crisis. Upon his accession in 1625 Charles I stood in need of finance which the English Parliament was in no mood to grant¹ and the new King turned to Scotland for assistance. In 1621 the Scots Parliament had granted his father a tax of £400,000 plus 5% for four years on all annual rents which Balfour described as "the greatest taxation that ever was granted in Scotland heretofore in any age".² In the very first year of Charles's reign this taxation was repeated by a Convention of Estates specially summoned for the purpose.³ On both⁴ occasions there were numerous complaints and "rebels for the taxation". The Convention of 1630 again voted for Charles a tax on annual rents payable as previously for four years in annual instalments⁵ while when the prorogued Parliament ultimately met at the time of Charles's Scottish coronation in 1633 it granted an even more liberal taxation⁶ to cover the royal expenses and imposed in addition an extraordinary/

1. Gardiner: Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution pXVlll-Vlll.
2. Balfour Annals 2 p84:AP 4 p597,600.
3. AP5:pl67-174 cf Appendix Vlll.
4. Hailes: Memorials of the Reign of James VI pl31 133 135: Bisho Book of the Old Edinburgh Club Xlll pl4.RPC(2nd series)1 pl33 (p331;2p427;3p204)
5. Ap 5 p209-217.
6. ib pl3-16.

ary levy on interest known as 'the tua of ten' designed to extract more revenue from the burgesses.⁷ These excessive taxations were bitterly resented and the King's subjects awaited an opportunity of exploiting their grievance.

Meanwhile Charles had antagonised the powerful nobility. Towards the end of 1625 he issued an Act of Revocation "the most ample that ever was made"⁸ which in its final revision offering reasonable compensation to all who should surrender, recalled to the Crown all erections and other dispositions of lands, ~~teinds~~ and patronages justly belonging to the church or Crown made in the two preceding reigns.⁹ This Revocation thus swept aside all Acts of Parliament confirming the various erections and incidentally nullified the erections made by James after 1606 as the counterpart of his restitution of the Bishoprics. From the very first there was widespread opposition to this sweeping act of the royal prerogative and in order to obtain surrenders Charles found it necessary to take action at law with a view to setting aside the charters of erection as null and void.¹⁰

Hand in hand with the royal Revocation went the royal policy in relation to the ~~teinds~~. The system of financing the ministers on the thirds had left the ~~teinds~~ too much to the disposal of the titular bishops, commendators and lords of erection and vested interests had been/

7. 1b p39.

8. Forbes: Church lands and Tithes p358.

9. RPC (2nd series) 1 p351-3 CV1.

10. 1b pcv.

created. These had been recognised by the Commissioners of stipend and kirks in 1617 and again in 1621 and the principle governing their transactions was that the clergy should get a sufficiency out of the teinds while the titulars¹¹ and tacksmen retained the rest. This was the principle on which Charles 1 went to work, with the exception that a third party, the needy Crown, now came into the reckoning.

In order to carry his policy to a successful issue Charles set up early in 1627 a Commission for the Surrender of Superiorities and Teinds.¹² There was a good deal of opposition and the commissioners found their work difficult enough. Eventually submissions were grudgingly and formally made by the various interested classes in the community to each of whom Charles announced his decisions in a Decreet Arbitral¹³ dated 2nd September 1629. These were ratified in the Parliament of 1633.¹⁴ The dispositions of church of Crown property made in the two previous reigns, except those in favour of the Bishops, were recalled to the Crown which

11 cf Appendix LX.

12 RPC (2nd series) 1 p 507-516. The function of this Commission was four-fold:

(1) To receive the surrender of superiorities from the Lords of Erection and of their right as titulars to teinds levied on other men's lands and to assess the amount of compensation due.

(2) To continue the work of the commissioners of 1617 and 1621 by planting kirks and extricating the teinds so that each man might have his own and the ministers receive a more adequate stipend out of the teinds of the parish.

(3) To establish a certain patrimony to the Crown out of the teinds which was to be perpetual.

(4) To refer their work to the King for his official approval.

13 RPC (2nd series) 3 p 336, 341, 416 etc: Mathieson: op cit 1 p 349.

14 AP5 : p 32-4.

undertook to compensate the Lords of Erection for loss of their feu duties at ten years purchase. As for the teinds every man was to possess his own either by annual lease or purchase from the titulars while the King was confirmed in his annuity and the clergy in a considerable augmentation of stipend.¹⁵

What were the re-actions to this vast enterprise of King Charles I in its final and legal form? It might have been expected that the clergy at least would have welcomed it. On the contrary they were for the most part strongly opposed to it. The kirk had hoped for the whole teind which it maintained was its lawful patrimony and not for a mere paring from the vast holdings of the titulars and others for the sole purpose of stipend augmentation. When the commission was first getting down to its work clerical deputies were despatched to His Majesty who objected to it being preached "that we nor no lay¹⁶ person could lawfully enjoy any benefit out of the tithes".

Charles diplomatically ordered special attention to be given to the planting of kirks and stipend increases but the clergy remained dissatisfied and throughout June 1627 they held numerous conferences in Edinburgh. Over the treatment of the teinds Episcopalian and Presbyterian met on common ground and it is significant that they proposed to send delegates to London to petition the King for a General Assembly. Amongst those placed

15 cf Appendix X: Birnie op cit p 42 f.

16 RPC (2nd series) 1 p CXCLX.

on the short leet was Bishop Patrick Forbes though he was not the eventual choice. It seems probable that he refused to let his name go forward, for the Bishops, with the exception of Lindsay of Ross, appear to have been opposed to the move on the ground that it would only serve to anger Charles.

The Bishops were as much opposed to the teind reforms as the clergy though what apparently weighed most with them was their fear lest the sale of teinds should eventually extinguish the patrimony of the kirk. By reason of their status under the Crown they could not display such open opposition as the clergy and they adopted an attitude of studied aloofness. Of this attitude Bishop Patrick Forbes was a consistent exponent. He was one of several prelates appointed to the Commission of Surrender in 1627 and he certainly took no active part in its proceedings. He was on the new commission appointed in 1631 but he did not put in an appearance and in 1633 he was amongst those who were sternly exhorted to be diligent in their duty. He had previously received similar letters and when a new commission was appointed this same year his name did not appear in the list of members. This may have been due to his illness but he had

17 Row p 344-5: Lawson op cit p 433 indeed all over the
18 Forbes: Church Lands and Tithes p 265, 266.
19 Row p 343-4: RPC (2nd series) 2 p XLIX, 309: 3 p 192 etc:
20 For the continuing lukewarmness of the clergy cf RPC
(2nd series) 1 p 309: 2 p 53-4, 87, 162 etc.
21 RPC (2nd series) 1 p 510.
22 ib 4 p 348.
23 ib 5 p 29.
24 ib 4 p 398, 399.
25 ib 5 p 124.
26 cf later,

certainly been most apathetic in the discharge of his duties and this seems more likely to have been the real reason for the omission of his name, for in the following year despite increasing infirmity we find him named amongst the members of the re-constituted Court of High Commission.²⁶

Most significant was a sharp protest given in by some nobles gentry and burgesses during the Convention of 1630 which raised religious points.²⁷ Another motive which must have weighed heavily with the Bishops in their attitude to the teind reforms was the desire to do nothing to aggravate the jealousy of the nobility and gentry towards the new prelatical order - a jealousy which Charles 1 had already seriously aggravated.²⁸ The atmosphere was charged with discontent and was steadily becoming increasingly inflammable. In the parishes small investigation committees had been appointed to go into the real value of local estates and through the moderators of the Presbyteries to report back to the national Commission for Surrenders.²⁹ In the north Banff was the only Presbytery which unduly delayed the appointment of local sub-commissioners and Patrick Forbes was commissioned by the Privy Council to hasten the members in the execution of their duty.³⁰ There is no evidence that he exerted himself in the matter. Indeed all over the

26 Baillie: Letters and Journals 1 p 425.

27 AP 5 p 219-220: Row p 350-1.

28 cf Appendix XI.

29 Row p 343: RPC (2nd series) 1 p 573, 686-7.

30 RPC (2nd series) 3 p 165.

country the work of valuation was significantly slow and the local committees did not achieve the object for which they had been established. On every side there was bickering over the commutation and purchase of the teinds and often under-³¹ valuation by collusion. Every device of King Charles to hasten on the work was without effect: changes in the personnel of commissioners, exhortations, assurances and threats left the³² mass of men sullen and unwilling.

Meanwhile Charles contrived to disturb the period of comparative peace in religious matters which the kirk was beginning to enjoy under the regime of the moderate Bishops of his Father's appointment. Of late there had been a growing re-action to the individualistic outlook of Calvinism with its doctrines of predestination and the elect, which expressed itself in the teaching of Arminius, a Dutch theologian of Continental répute whose main beliefs were in free will,³³ universal grace and conditional election. As men under the new influence recoiled from the tenets of Calvinism, so they recoiled from its drab and dreary externals. Both Charles, who had an inordinate love for externals, and his favourite ecclesiastical adviser William Laud, Bishop of London and later Archbishop of Canterbury, had been caught up in the spirit of the

31. Connell: Tithes 1 p 442-3 etc.
 32 ib 1 p 241-9, 368-9: RPC (2nd series) 4 p 131: 5 p 29, 32, 124 etc of Appendix Xll.
 33 Harrison: The Beginnings of Arminianism p 150-1.

117

revival and longed to restore to the church many of her ancient
rites and practices.³⁴

There had been nothing in the Book of Common Order, or in the First Book of Discipline about vestments or ceremonies. These had been left to be determined by usage and the kirk had early decided against them as "the dregs of Papistry"³⁵ and the Genevan gown of Knox fast established itself as the ministerial dress north of the Tweed.³⁶ The controversy over the Five Articles of Perth had rendered impossible the introduction of a generally accepted liturgy which the Aberdeen Assembly of 1616 had thought desirable and the Service Book subsequently undertaken and completed by Bishop Cowper in 1619 was never published. It was avowed³⁷ by a conflation of the Knoxian Book of Common Order with the 1559 Anglican Book of Common Prayer and was plainly designed so as to be conciliatory.³⁷

Charles and Laud set themselves to remedy what they conceived to be defects in the worship of the Scottish Church and to bring it into line with the official standards of the Church of England. Their task was rendered the more difficult as Laud was busy trying to enforce in England the use of crucifixes, images, copes and other pre-Reformation symbols,³⁸ things which were even more suspect in Scotland. In 1629 Charles sent for Cowper's unprinted

34 Prynn: A Breviate of The Life of William Laud p 159-178, 284 etc.

35 Knox 2 p 276 passim.

36 cf Appendix XlII.

37 Sprott: Scottish Liturgies of the Reign of James VI: Introduction and pp 1-114 Mathieson: op cit 1 p 363-4.

38 Prynn: op cit p 58 f, 63 f, 69 f, 72 etc.

Liturgy but it was far from satisfying Laud who wished to³⁹ introduce the Anglican Prayer Book into the kirk. Two years later Charles ordered the Scottish Archbishops to arrange for the vesting of Cathedral clergy and choirs in the surplice; nothing⁴⁰ however would appear to have been done. It was probably with a view to securing the introduction of the English Prayer Book and also the use of the surplice, that Charles took Laud to Scotland with him for his Coronation visit in 1633.

The coronation service, managed over the heads of the Scottish Bishops by Laud himself, was an ornate affair intended to be an object lesson to Calvinistic kirkmen in the use of Anglican⁴¹ vestments and ritual. During the course of the royal visit⁴² nothing definite was done about the introduction of a Prayer Book but surplices and rochets continued to make their appearance⁴³ and created very mixed feelings amongst the clergy. Charles and Laud, however, were not content to leave it to one or two Bishops and a few of the clergy to induce the acceptance of ecclesiastical vestments amongst the vast majority of their brethren. In the Parliament which followed the coronation the King caused the Lords of the Articles to couple together for ratification the Act of 1606 declaratory of the royal prerogative with an Act of 1609 which⁴⁴ gave the sovereign the right to regulate the apparel of churchmen.

39 Rushworth: Historical Collections 1 p 187: Heylyn: Life of Laud p 223.

40 Story: History of The Church of Scotland 2 p 496: Dauney: Ancient Scottish Melodies 1. p 365 f.

41 Spalding: op cit 1 p 17-8: Rushworth: op cit 2 p 182.

42 Spalding op cit p 20: Row p 363.

43 Row p 367.

44 AP 5 p 20-1.

Shortly after his return to England Charles took advantage of this measure to order the full Anglican dress for the Bishops and the surplice for the clergy on all religious occasions except⁴⁵ preachings. In the summer of 1634 the Bishops received orders to prepare Canons and a Liturgy for the Scottish Church, the latter⁴⁶ to be as near to the Anglican as possible. Meanwhile Charles commanded the English Prayer Book to be used in the Cathedrals and private households of the Bishops and increased the occasions⁴⁷ of its use in the Chapel-royal.

The older Bishops were against the bringing in of the surplice and rochet and had opposed the introduction of the Anglican Prayer Book on the ground that it would stir up contention since their countrymen were "very jealous of the least dependence on the church of England".⁴⁸ The Bishops had stated that the people would be better pleased with a Service Book of their own, but with the tension that existed after 1633 they were divided over the expediency of introducing it, the more so as it was to be strictly Anglican in tone and was to be imposed upon the church on the sole authority of the King. The older Bishops would only go so far in meeting the liturgical requirements of Charles and Laud and expressed the view that "a full conformity in the churches must⁴⁹ be the work of time". When after some delay and the application

45 Row p 367.

46 Sprott: op cit p XLVlll f: Prynne: op cit l p 150. Prynne gives the date of this order as September 28th 1634: cf Laud: Troubles and Tryal l p 75.

47 Rushworth: op cit 2 p 205.

48 Heylyn: op cit p 223: Row: Life of Blair p 137: Guthry: Memoirs p 13-18 Sprott: op cit p XLVl.

49 Rushworth: op cit 2 p 293.

of pressure on the part of the King, the Book was actually printed towards the close of 1636, it was very largely the work of two junior Bishops of Charles's own appointing, Maxwell of Ross and Wedderburn of Dunblane, revised by Archbishop Laud and Bishops Juxon of London and Wren of Norwich.⁵⁰ The Canons which had been published earlier this same year are said to have been drafted by Bishops Maxwell, Wedderburn, Bellenden and Sydserf and revised by Laud and Juxon.⁵¹ Their obvious indebtedness to the Anglican Canons of 1604 instead of to the enactments of bygone assemblies as had been proposed when the Canons were first mooted in 1616,⁵³ their re-statement of the substance of The Five Articles of Perth, and above all their publication on the prerogative of the Crown without any discussion in synod or assembly caused grave concern and unrest.⁵⁴

In this, the second great religious controversy which arose during his Episcopate, Bishop Patrick Forbes did not play any conspicuous part. That he did not do so was due to increasing infirmity. In 1632 a stroke paralysed the whole of his right side. He was compelled for purposes of subscription only, to learn to use the pen with his left hand and had to be carried to academic occasions.⁵⁵ In these latter years the good Bishop concentrated as much as in him lay upon diocesan affairs and took

50 Grub: op cit 2 p 377: Sprott: op cit p LXII f: Laud: Works 3 p 335. cf J. Cooper: *Liturgy of 1637 (1904)*

51 Prynne: op cit 1 p 152: Grub: op cit 2 p 366.

52 cf Laud: Works 5 p 585-606: Prothero: *Statutes and Constitutional Documents* p 444-5.

53 cf Chapter III.

54 Gordon: op cit 2 p 92: Clarendon: *History of the Rebellion* 1 p 172: Baillie: *Letters and Journals* 1 p 4.

55 Garden 1 p 282: Spalding: op cit 1 p 39: *Funerals* p XCIV.

121

no active part in the wider issues affecting church and state.⁵⁶
His last appearance at a Privy Council meeting was in July 1631.
Two years later he could not travel as far as Alford in his own
⁵⁷diocese and was quite unable to journey to Edinburgh for the
⁵⁸coronation of the King and the important Parliament which followed.
It was in May of this year - 1633 - that Archbishop Spottiswoode
wrote to Forbes telling him how greatly his counsel was missed in
⁵⁹the affairs of the church at large and towards the end of 1634
when he was unable to be as active as usual in the affairs of King's
⁶⁰College, the Bishop was most certainly not one of the prelates then
employed in the preparation of the new Prayer Book. When Maxwell,
in April 1635, carried back to London a draft of the Bishops' work
with instructions to state that "they had done all that was possible
⁶¹to meet the views of the King", Patrick Forbes was dead.

In view of the fact that during the last three years of his life
he was unable to write or to travel, statements to the effect that
Bishop Forbes "strongly opposed Charles 1's plans for conforming the
⁶²church to the English pattern", require to be modified. Garden
tells us that "as long as his health would allow him to attend upon
public meetings, he opposed the bringing in of the Liturgy and
Forms of prayer and administration of the Sacrament according to the

56 RPC (2nd series) 4 p 293.

57 Antiquities of Aberdeen and Banff 4 p 136, 137.

58 Spalding: op cit 1 p 18.

59 Funerals p 217.

60 Fasti Aberdonenses p 398-9.

61 Rushworth: op cit 2 p 293: Garden § 17 p 6: Patrick Forbes
died on Easter Eve 28th March 1635.

62 DNB XLX p 408.

English usage, not that he either reckoned them unlawful or altogether without their use, but because the generality were possessed with such prejudices against them as he was of opinion their introduction would be the occasion of mobs and confusion in this nation and schisms and contentions in the church".⁶³

This much then we may conclude: that in common with his brother Bishops, Patrick Forbes stood out against Laud's desire to introduce the English Liturgy in 1629; that during his infirmity he remained in entire sympathy and agreement with those Bishops who sought to delay the publication of any set form of service, made no attempt to enforce the surplice and did not favour⁶⁴ rochets; and that in his own diocese he made perfectly clear his antipathy to these innovations. With the divine right theory of Episcopacy which was being propounded at this time in both England and Scotland by exponents of Laud's school and which further disturbed men of Presbyterian inclinations, Forbes had⁶⁵ no sympathy. It was from the practical point of view that⁶⁶ Forbes had accepted Episcopacy. He held, ~~as did~~ his son, Doctor

63 Garden § 14 p 5: Wodrow: op cit p 94.

64 The portraits of Archbishop Spottiswoode and Bishop Patrick Forbes show them in the customary black gown. Forbes's portrait which is in the possession of Aberdeen University is reproduced as a frontispiece in Wodrow's Biographical Collections.

65 Row p 354: Mathieson: op cit 1 p 322.

66 cf Chapter 111.

John Forbes, that the episcopal form of government was of the
 "melius esse" rather than of the "esse" of the Christian Church⁶⁷
 and was of the opinion that churches "agreeing soundly in all
 the substantial points of faith" may differ in church government.⁶⁸

The persistent incursion of the royal prerogative into
 religious affairs was widely resented amongst the clergy as an
 infringement of the constitution of the kirk. It led directly
 to Melville's doctrine of the Two Kingdoms - that of the
 reigning sovereign and that of Christ the King - being developed⁶⁹
 into an energetic exposition of the divine right of Presbytery.
 This made it quite impossible for men of moderate views to cement
 that form of polity with Episcopacy and the fusion which had
 been brought about under James VI was put to an increasing
 strain. Between the divine right Episcopalians like Bishop
 Maxwell and the divine right Presbyterians like Samuel
 Rutherford there could be no compromise. Patrick Forbes's view
 as to the ultimate effect of the religious policy pursued by
 Charles and Laud was that of a shrewd observer who, had he
 lived in the pre-Reformation era when Bishops were often the

67 J. Forbes: *Irenicum* (1629) Bk 2 Chapter XI Proposition
 XIII: *Enbulus* p 23, 29 etc: *A Defence of The Lawful
 Calling* p 5-8, 46, 47 etc. The statement that Bishop
 Patrick Forbes was allied to Laud's party in the religious
 controversy of the day which occurs in that section (p 53)
 of W. E. McCulloch's '*Vires Illustres Abredonensium*'
 compiled from Bullochs '*History of The University of Aberdeen*'
 is quite inaccurate.

68 *A Defence of the Lawful Calling* p 5.

69 Rutherford: *The Divine Right of Church Government and
 Excommunication* (London 1646).

chief advisers of the King, would assuredly have been one of our greatest ecclesiastical statesmen. Within three years of his death the disruption which he feared in church and state had come to pass.

As the 1630's advanced there were indeed many signs that the storm was growing in intensity and coming to a climax. During the Parliament of 1633 a supplication drawn up by several lords, lairds and burgess members was presented to the King. The points which it raised were "some church business, annual rents and extraordinary ⁷⁰taxation". It was ominous that these diverse grievances were brought together by different classes of the community who hitherto had little in common. Some of the nobility voted especially against the Acts of this Parliament because they contained kirk business while many members were sure that the King had juggled with the votes in order to secure the necessary ⁷¹majority. The following year those of all parties who had voted against the royal measures framed a further supplication in which they protested against church novations, the 'tua of ten' and the recent heavy taxations. The tone of this petition was decidedly ominous for it plainly implied that the whole of ⁷²the ecclesiastical settlement of James VI was unjust and illegal. The nobles, resentful of the solution proposed for the church property question, were challenging the prerogative by which it ⁷³was to be effected. Aiton quite aptly summed up the effect of the

70 Row p 365.

71 ib p 366-7.

72 ib p 376-381.

73 cf A Large Declaration p 6, 15.

King's land and teind measures by remarking that the nobles⁷⁴
 "made religion a mere stalking-horse to their own interests".

The real trouble was the extensive scope and initiative which the Scottish constitutional machinery gave to the royal prerogative and since those measures affecting the disposition of church property had been passed in a constitutional manner there was no ground for a direct attack on the prerogative in the economic or political spheres. But as it happened Charles was indiscreet enough to continue to employ the prerogative in the religious sphere where it had always been challenged and thus to present all who had a grievance to exploit with an opportunity to resist. The nobility could find to hand within the kirk a ready made philosophy of resistance. Calvinism, which was still the **standard** of belief in the Scottish Church, had introduced into practical politics the old mediaeval theory of a sovereignty limited by the will and aspirations of the people and had already challenged divine right absolutisms over the greater part of Europe. Thus the aggrieved laity reposed their hope of material salvation in Calvinism and those who became Protestants in order to get the property of the old church became Covenanters in order to keep it. Within a year of the publication of the new Prayer Book a National Covenant, couched in religious phraseology, but referring the King to the Statute Book no less than fifty-⁷⁵ seven times and calling for a free Assembly and a free Parliament,

74 Aiton: The Life and Times of Alexander Henderson p 137.

75 Peterkin: Records of the Kirk p 9-13: Baillie: op cit
 1 p 53.

76

had been widely subscribed. Drummond of Hawthornden saw clearly the force of this document when he denounced it because "it giveth a law to the King",⁷⁷ Before the close of this same year, 1638 an Assembly carefully managed by the Covenanters had met at Glasgow,⁷⁸ deposed the Bishops and restored Presbyterianism. In the Parliament of 1640 measures were passed which curtailed the prerogative of the Crown and the Covenanting - Parliamentarians⁷⁹ could at length inform their brethren in England: "We have shown that the King's Crown is not tied to a Prelate's mitre".⁸⁰

The use of Episcopacy as the chief device of an absolutist monarchy in increasing conflict with the aspirations and interests of its subjects seriously compromised the position of the Bishops as civil servants, and in the end it was jealousy of, and antipathy to their political status and not any antipathy to the Bishops themselves or to their ecclesiastical office, which accomplished their downfall. In the circumstances of the time it did not behove the Bishops to discharge their civil functions in an active or conspicuous manner. The realisation of this was probably one reason why we find Bishop Patrick Forbes so little concerned in the management of state affairs. In the Articles and Parliament of 1621 he would appear to have been only interested in the religious question of the time.⁸¹ He was present

76 Gordon: op cit 1 p 44-5: Rothes: Relation p 79-80.

77 Napier: Memorials of Montrose 1 p 78.

78 Baillie: op cit 1 p 157-160: Gordon: op cit 2 p 92-4: 1 p 181 f: Balfour: Annals 2 p 311.

79 AP 5 p 290-319: Spalding: op cit 1 p 213-4: Burnet: Dukes of Hamilton p 171.

80 Spalding: op cit 1 p 246.

81. cf. ch. V

in the Convention of Estates in 1625 and in the Conventions held⁸² at Edinburgh in 1630 and in 1631, but in none of these gatherings does he come before us as one who took a prominent part though the business before them was of considerable national⁸³ importance.

Shortly after his consecration Forbes succeeded his predecessor,⁸⁴ Bishop Alexander Forbes, on the Privy Council. When that body was reconstituted by Charles I in 1626 he was one of the prelates⁸⁵ appointed to the new Council. But he was only "present⁸⁶ occasionally in the Council after his admission" and then his chief concern would appear to have been to watch the interests⁸⁷ of the kirk in the supreme court of the land. From 1622-1625 Bishop Forbes attended the Privy Council only six times and no⁸⁸ member was more infrequent in his attendances. Again from 1627-⁸⁹ 1628 he recorded only the same number of appearances. At this time there were nominally fifty members of the Council but there was never more than twenty present and the average attendance was an extremely low one - twelve or thirteen. Even so Forbes's⁹⁰ tally of attendances was well below the average.

82 RPC (2nd series) 1 p 141, 150: AP 5 p 166, 208, 236.

83 The Convention of 1625 revealed a remarkable tendency to assert itself against an absolutist monarch which foreshadowed that struggle between King and people for political sovereignty centred round the National Covenant of 1638 and was the issue of the Parliament of 1640. It refused one of the royal demands went beyond its agenda actually protested to the King against the measures which he contemplated and took upon itself the discussion of subjects not in the royal draft of business. of AP 5 p 184 f.

84 RPC (1st series) 11 p 438: Botfield: op cit 2 p 566-7.

85 RPC (2nd series) 1 p 248-9.

86 ib (1st series) 11 p CL11.

87 ib passim (2nd series) 1-4 passim.

88 ib (1st series) 13 p XI.

89 ib (2nd series) 1 p 353, 357, 374, 380, 383.

90 ib 2 p VII1.

During 1629-1630 the Privy Council sat of 127 days and the Bishop of Aberdeen was present on only three of these days. Only one other prelate had such a poor record of attendances - the Bishop of Ross. His See was in the remote north and in accounting for the frequent absence of Forbes from the Council table we must remember that his See was also far removed from Edinburgh where the meetings of the Privy Council were invariably held at this time. Still distance was not insuperable even in those days and Forbes's appearances were so infrequent that we are forced to the conclusion that other considerations weighed with him. Comparisons are sometimes illuminating and for this period we find that Archbishop Spottiswoode put in 21 appearances and the Bishop of Dunblane found time to make as many as 91. When the Council was again reconstituted by Charles in March 1631, all the councillors but one, Patrick Forbes included, retained their seats, the King's object in the move being apparently to remind his tardy officers of state that they held their positions solely at his royal pleasure.⁹² Forbes, however, attended the Privy Council for the last time when it met at Holyrood House, Edinburgh on 26th July this same year.⁹³ The following year he was struck down with apoplexy and was thereafter quite unable to travel.⁹⁴ He was therefore not present at the meetings of the Council during those critical years when Charles was using it to impose his highly unpopular decisions upon church and state. It is therefore obvious that Garden's reference to the Bishop opposing the religious novations of the King "as long

91 ib 3 p V-VI.

92 ib 4 p 187-190.

93 ib p 293.

94 cf supra.

as his health would allow him to attend upon public meetings" must not be taken to cover attendance at Council sessions. ⁹⁵ It must have been at such public meetings as he was able to attend with in his own diocese that Forbes opposed the religious policy of Charles I.

This detached attitude on the part of Bishop Forbes towards the Privy Council was, in the circumstances of the time, undoubtedly a wise one and enhanced rather than diminished his reputation as a statesman. Here was a prelate of undoubted administrative ability, of good birth and of moderate views who did not seek even to share - far less to usurp - the place and authority of laymen, but who, where what he conceived to be the true interests of the church did not intervene, was content to leave the business of state management in the hands of lay officers. Consequently, as we are informed, when he was present at Privy Council meetings, his opinion "carried so great weight with his colleagues that it was generally followed, great confidence being placed in his judgement and equity". ⁹⁶ This statement is sufficiently borne out by a study of the Registers of the Privy Council which cover the years 1618-1631 but it receives additional support from the number of committees of state upon which the Bishop was invited to serve. In 1620 we find him on the committee of Council charged to report upon the best way of raising money for the defence of the Palatinate. This committee decided that a

95 cf supra.

96 Garden } 13 p 4.

voluntary contribution would be hopeless and advised James VI to
 call a Parliament.⁹⁷ The King, however, was unwilling to take this
 step and a little later the Bishop found himself upon a committee
 of fourteen specially chosen to re-consider the financial
 possibilities. The fourteen rightly concluded that they had no
 authority to impose a taxation and suggested a Parliament which⁹⁸
 James shortly summoned.⁹⁹ About the same time Forbes, whose wise
 and firm handling of the affairs of King's College, Aberdeen,
 made him almost an automatic choice, was appointed to a state
 commission charged with visiting St Andrews University in order
 to reform various abuses there.¹⁰⁰ In 1630 he was on the commission
 appointed to survey the laws of the land with powers to print
 unprinted laws and statutes and to set down general customs¹⁰¹
 "inviolably observed in the Kingdom" and this same year he was
 one of the commissioners whose duty it was to investigate the
 condition of the Scottish fishing industry.¹⁰²

In addition to all this state work with which he was entrusted,
 the Bishop as a Privy Councillor was called upon to carry out
 in his own locality various decrees of Council. Many of these
 were concerned with Romanists but there also fell to him the duty¹⁰³
 of supervising local defence measures, of taking the oaths of
 newly appointed sheriffs when these could not conveniently appear

97 RPC (1st series) 12 p 379.

98 ib p 404-5.

99 AP 4 p 589-590.

100 RPC (1st series) 12 p 607: Botfield: op cit 2 p 672-3.

101 RPC (2nd series) 4 p 138.

102 AP 5 p 223, 225.

103 RPC (2nd series) 2 p 54.

before the Council¹⁰⁴ and of investigating on the spot matters which concerned that court as the supreme judicatory of the Kingdom. For instance there occurred at Frendraught in 1630 a mysterious fire in which six persons were burnt to death. It was a particularly involved business embracing religious differences and family feuds and there were several suspects. Bishop Forbes was commissioned by the Council to examine Lord Forbes upon the interrogation given in by the Laird of Frendraught and with certain others to visit the scene of the disaster "to consider the frame and structure thereof and how and by what means the fire was raised within the same and if the fire was accidental or done of set purpose.....". The commissioners duly carried out their investigation on 13th April 1631 and reported back to the Council.¹⁰⁵

Mention may also be made of the fact that Patrick Forbes was twice named a Justice of the Peace for Aberdeenshire.¹⁰⁶ We do not know to what extent he fulfilled the duties of this office, but the probability is that he did not greatly exert himself - at least we do not find him active in reporting back to the Privy Council as he was supposed to do and he was already a busy man.¹⁰⁷ The office was a comparatively new one in Scotland. James VI had introduced it from the English model in 1587 and on that account alone the

104 ib 3 p 292: 4 p 535-6: 5 p 359.
 105 ib 4 p L11, 207-8, 214.
 106 ib (1st series) 13 p 348 : (2nd series) 5 p 386.
 107 Malcolm: The Minutes of The Justices of the Peace for Lanarkshire (SHS 1931) p XLV-XV.
 108 AP 3 p 459: 4 p 434.

institution was decidedly unpopular. Archbishop Gladstones was a Justice of the Peace but he had very little respect for an office which was without the warrant of law or the force of custom and several attempts on the part of James to make the system work met with very scanty success. The King had recourse to threats while in 1633 the Privy Council were empowered to impose penalties upon negligent Justices of the Peace and the following year Charles I was compelled to try the experiment of appointing J. P's from lists of clergy selected at his instance by the Diocesans. The Bishops could scarcely have welcomed this new departure which would further compromise the church as established under them at a very critical juncture.

The picture which we have of Bishop Patrick Forbes is that of a distinguished public servant within the limits which were imposed by circumstances and which he set for himself. For Forbes was first a diocesan administrator, secondly an ecclesiastical administrator in the church at large, and only thirdly, where the interests of the two former administrations did not conflict with this latter, an administrator in the affairs of state. He put the spiritual aspect of his office before its temporal aspects and was not what we should call a committee man being a pastoral rather than a conciliar Bishop, a Father-in-God who preferred to devote himself to the work which his diocese required of him. This more than any other reason may be taken to account for his infrequent appearances at meetings of the Privy Council.

109 Malcolm: op cit p Xl f.

110 RPC (1st series) 9 p 220, 503 f: 519 etc.

111 AP 5 p 42, 219.

112 RPC 2nd series) 5 p 173, 228: 6 p 496-7.

Chapter VII.

Patrick Forbes and the Diocese of Aberdeen.

While he was active to a degree in the affairs of Church and State and was keenly interested in the burning issues of the day, Patrick Forbes, like his great predecessor William Elphinstone, was first and foremost a shepherd of the flock of Christ committed to his care. He was, as his Funerals so aptly describe him a "Father-in-God".¹ Almost his first concern was to see competent spiritual leaders and teachers in the pulpits and parishes of his diocese. Indeed it was this desire which led him to make almost all of his University reforms. Like Elphinstone he regarded King's College, Aberdeen, almost exclusively as a training school for the future clergy and he took steps to make that school an efficient one.² His zeal for the Lord's House in a spiritually depressed corner of the Kingdom gave him the vision and the strength for the task. His careful supervision of the training of the clergy, whereby he had to hand a supply of fit and worthy men, together with his ability to choose the right man-or to influence the choice of the right man-for any particular piece of God's work, laid the foundation of his success as a Bishop.³ In this respect Sibbald in his funeral oration

1 Funerals: Title Page and Passim.

2 cf Chapter VIII.

3 Garden § 10 p 3: Funerals p lxxvi, 76.

134

spoke thus of his late Diocesan: "He took care to plant good and worthy pastors for the present time and such was the success of his care, that never any of the worthy prelates that went before him had such a learned clergy....None had more sagacity to discern good spirits or care to promote them".⁴

Patrick Forbes did not believe in importing clerics of whom he knew only through hearsay or at second hand. He believed emphatically in having under him men locally trained, men who knew him and whom he knew- men well aware of the task which local conditions would impose upon them. Whenever a vacancy occurred in a parish the Bishop sought from amongst the regents of the University the man whom he thought by piety and learning best qualified for the post, filling his place in turn with the most promising student.⁵ Nor would he yield to the popular choice if he thought he had a more suitable man for a vacant living- as at Stains in 1619 when he made an appointment which was contrary to the wish of the parishioners.⁶ To this prudent and just policy can be attributed that singular efficiency and peace which so largely prevailed throughout the entire diocese during his episcopate.⁷

4 Funerals p 116.

5 ib LXXVII. Note the number of vacancies filled under Bishop Forbes with Aberdeen men, cf Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 passim.

6 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 p 201.

7 Garden 3 12 p 4: 53 p 27.

The Bishop was very much concerned to secure amongst his clergy a high standard of preaching for he held that "none ordinarily can believe but by hearing, or hear but by preaching".⁸ And here, as in all else, he was at pains to set the example himself. We are told that he was an eloquent preacher and was careful to occupy the pulpit each Sunday.⁹ As Ordinary of the Diocese Forbes had authority over all the clergy and the final voice in all ministerial appointments,¹⁰ while his influence was such that patrons would the more readily give ear to his suggestions. Thus as Bishop he was able to assist the promotion of the most promising of his clergy. Scrogie moved from Drumoak to St Machar's Cathedral,¹¹ Baron from Keith to Greyfriars and the Chair of Divinity at Marischal College,¹² Ross from an obscure country charge to St Clements in Aberdeen burgh,¹³ Sibbald from a regency in Marischal to the first charge of St Nicholas,¹⁴ Andrew Strachan from Logie-Durno to the Professorship of Divinity at King's College.¹⁵ Forbes realised the need to bring men of particular light and learning to the centre of population that the Word of God might fall with impelling force upon the ears of the multitude and so be spread abroad. His policy

8 A Defence of The Lawful Calling etc p 39.

9 Funerals p 163, 297: Garden⁸ 9 p 3: p 108: Row p 315: Exercises Grub 2 p 354. The House of Forbes p 316 (quotation): J. Forbes: Spiritual

10 cf BUK p 1097-8, 1104 f: Botfield: op cit 1 p 245.

11 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ 6 p 18, 50: Funerals p 79 (n).

12 ib p 8, 319 : Kennedy: Annals 2 p 119.

13 ib p 27 : Spalding: op cit 1 p 167.

14 ib p 36-7 : Kennedy: op cit 2 p 118.

15 ib p 151 : Aberdeen University Review V. 22 p 20 f

was eminently successful and during his occupancy of the Bishopric the pulpits of Aberdeen enjoyed a European reputation.¹⁶ Of the men whom Bishop Forbes promoted Irving could write: "They were an honour to the Church both by their lives and by their learning and with that excellent temper they seasoned that whole diocese, both clergy and laity, that it continues to this day very much distinguished from all the rest of Scotland, both for learning, loyalty and peaceableness."¹⁷

While he was careful to supply the leading pulpits with eloquent and able men, Forbes was equally alive to the necessity of diligence on the part of the ordinary parish clergy. We may be sure that he did not spare a negligent or worthless pastor. Woodrow translating Garden informs us that; "In the summer he had a custom of visiting all his parish churches and this without train of attendants that his visits might in no degree prove burdensome to the clergy or gentry. His examination into the spiritual conditions of each parish, the character and ministerial ability and fidelity of each incumbent was minute and honest. He would arrive in the neighbourhood on Saturday without giving notice to anyone and would make his appearance in the parish church on Sunday, carefully noting what he saw and heard. Afterwards if need required he proceeded by private admonitions to correct in the pastor what he saw amiss in his conduct or manner, in his mode of instructing his flock or in the general condition of the parish."

16 Funerals p LXXVI.

17 Irving: Lives of Scottish Writers 2 p 46: cf Fasti Aberdonenses p XLl.

When a case occurred of scandal arising to the church from the ignorance or carelessness or the misconduct of a minister, the Bishop assisted by some of his clergy immediately instituted a visitation of the parish, removed the unworthy profaners of the mysteries of God and supplied their places with fruitful pastors."¹⁸

Though Bishop Forbes was a disciplinarian he was no autocrat. He believed that the Bishop should rule with "such moderation of place and power as may put restraint to excessive usurpation" and mindful of the tyrannical episcopates of former times he did not condemn those who for this reason could not reconcile themselves to the institution of Bishops in the Scottish Church.¹⁹ He was genial and kindly, modest and brotherly in his relations with those who served under him and did not hesitate to ask his brethren of the clergy to point out to him what they conceived to be his faults or mistakes. He held Diocesan Synods twice a year and "on these occasions before any other business was taken up, he requested his clergy if they knew anything wrong in his conduct to use all freedom with him, to warn him in private of secret errors and if they were public to mention them openly".²⁰ A man of deep piety and rich learning he disliked controversy and longed to see all differences composed in a Christian manner. He was a mid-man for Christ's sake seeking wherever possible to establish peace

18 Garden § 9 p 3: Wodrow: op cit p 95-6: Funerals p LXXV.

19 Funerals p LVIII: Calderwood 7 p 291 f.

20 Grub 2 p 354 following Garden § 9 p 3: cf Funerals p LXXX f.

and to promote love. He worked with his subordinates rather than above or against them.²¹ The Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen show him as a Bishop working in the closest co-operation and harmony with Synod, Presbyteries and Kirk Sessions.²² In difficult cases of discipline we find him conferring with the Kirk Session concerned.²³ In such undertakings as the erection of a school²⁴ or the creation of a new parish,²⁵ or in the case of an offence likely to have a serious issue for the offender,²⁶ we find him acting through or with the Presbytery or Synod.

It is surely indicative of the sweet reasonableness and saintliness of Bishop Patrick Forbes that at the time of his death, Archbishop Spottiswoode thought of him not as a brother prelate but simply as a grave and graceful pastor.²⁷ For Forbes a Bishop was 'primus inter pares': he regarded the historic office as a pastoral and not a penal one. His rule was the rule of love and when Doctor John Forbes emphasised in the 'Irenicum'²⁸ that the moderator ought to be himself subject to censure, to superintend with kindness, without any tyrannical contempt or despotism; that he should not conclude any weighty matter without the consent of his co-presbyters he not only drew upon ancient sources but had before him a living picture

- 21 Garden § 8 p 3 § 9 p 3 § 13: 14 p 4-5: Burnet: Life of Bedell. Preface. Funerals p 73, 75, 217-8, 297: Eubulus. Preface.
- 22 Selections from the Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen p 89-92, 109: Records of Old Aberdeen p 7.
- 23 Selections from the Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen p 89-90.
- 24 Antiquities of Aberdeen and Banff 4 p 136.
- 25 ib 2 p 391-2.
- 26 RPC (2nd series) 3 p 173-4.
- 27 Funerals p 218.
- 28 Historical Papers CUA. p 148.

of the ideal type of Christian Bishop in the person of his greatly revered father. **Garden** sums up Patrick Forbes as a diocesan Bishop in these words: "With his brethren the clergy the Bishop lived on the most intimate and friendly footing. Without their advice and consent he made it a rule to do nothing, in this respect, carefully observing the primitive order that in the management of the diocese, the Bishop should exercise no despotic sway but in all things concede to the Presbyters their due place and honour".²⁹

The Bishop's relations with his laity were equally cordial. Whenever occasion arose he used his influence to prevent litigation and bloodshed and was held in such high esteem that he was frequently called upon to act as arbiter in difficult disputes. On the occasion of the Bishop's death one who had known him intimately spoke thus of him: "When advanced to ecclesiastical and secular preferment he governed the difficult and turbulent state of this church, wherein he did encounter with so many distempered judgements, perverse and unruly humours, in peace and quietness these seventeen years with wonderful dexterity. By this he, as honorary arbiter according to the practice of the most holy and ancient Bishops, settled the variances of laymen having recourse to his wisdom as to an oracle- variances which if

not composed by him might have broken out into the same doleful effects which the like dissensions have brought to other parts of the country".³⁰ Two examples must suffice to illustrate how the Bishop was at pains to settle lay differences peaceably and with justice. On one occasion he was put to a caution of 500 ~~marks~~ and under pain of horning for communicating with one who was "at the horn for murder by the relatives of Gilbert Keith". Forbes was about to gain a reconciliation between the murderer, Duncan Forbes, and the relatives of the murdered man, and it seemed to him that there were extenuating circumstances. He therefore continued his interest in the case and interceded with the Privy Council for a suspension of process in order to allow him to settle the feud and his request was granted.³¹ After the Reformation the division of the area of the parish church among the heritors was a common source of animosity. By law the determination of such questions lay with the Ordinary of the Diocese. In 1622 there arose a sharp dispute in the parish of Peterhead between two heritors- Sir William Keith and the Laird of Muchalls. The former, richer and more influential than his rival, had secured from the King a letter ordering the Bishop of Aberdeen to award the disputed sittings in his favour. To this mandate Forbes paid not the slightest heed. He put the Laird of Muchalls in possession of the disputed area of the church and at the same time wrote to the

30 Funerals p 162-3: Garden § 13 p 4.

31 RPC (1st series) 13 p 179, 216, 237, 302.

141

Secretary of the Privy Council to the effect that he was indeed indebted to the Crown for his position, but that his conscience was his Gods'. On learning of this reply the King is said to have remarked that he blessed God that he had such a Bishop who in the face of the most powerful solicitations knew how to perform his duty.

There was one other phase of the Bishops diocesan policy in the constant prosecution of which he showed himself to be a truly great Christian shepherd. One of the outstanding problems which confronted the kirk when he came to the See of Aberdeen in 1618 was that of re-establishing the parochial system- to provide as far as possible a pastor for each parish. The problem was due to the shortage of man-power owing to the inadequacy and uncertainty of stipends and had in no way been eased by the commissioners for kirks and stipend who, in order to save the pockets of the nobility and gentry, persistently joined two or more parishes under one incumbent. The commissioners of 1617 and 1621 did not effect a just or practical solution and all over the country, especially in the diocese of Aberdeen where from 1605 onwards man-power was

- 32 RPC. (1st series) 13 p 88: Wodrow: op cit p 96: Funerals p LXXXI-11. Neither Shand nor Wodrow following Garden give the date or place of this dispute. The omission is supplied by reference to the Register of the Privy Council.
- 33 cf Chapter 111.

considerably under strength, there were parishes utterly
 devoid of any spiritual ministrations and parishes comprising a
 wide and unworkable area in the charge of a single minister.³⁵
 Forbes who was nominated to the commission in 1621³⁶ took a firm
 line. He set himself to supply vacancies and to disjoin as
 many parishes as possible.³⁷ We find him immediately seeking
 powers of ratification for the disjunction of kirks formerly
 united within his diocese.³⁸ Several parishes in the Aberdeen
 34 of 16.

35 It has been asserted that after 1617 the commissioners for
 the plantation of kirks united as many as 200 parishes in order
 to reduce the number of kirks and stipends and so lighten
 their task in the face of the land and teind owning classes.
 Thus, for instance, Bishop Bellenden of Dunblane, one of the
 commission, received 1000 merks from Lord Madertie for
 uniting in his Lordship's property and so saving him various
 stipend expenses, while Bishop Cowper of Galloway, despite
 many remonstrances was forced to please the Laird of Bombie
 in the same fashion cf RPC (2nd series) 1 p CLXXIII.

36 AP 4 p 606.

37 Garden § 9 p 3: Grub 2 p 353.

38 AP 4 p 607.

Diocese had been united under the commissioners of 1617-
 Logymar, for instance, was united to Coldstone as Logie-
 Coldstone,³⁹ Kearn had been annexed to Forbes,⁴⁰ and Bourtie to
 Bethelnie.⁴¹

During the episcopate of Patrick Forbes, ~~Maxwell's time~~⁴²
~~town of Aberdeen~~⁴³, the cures of Glenbuchat,⁴⁴ Tarland and Midmar,⁴⁵
 vacant from 1580 onwards, were all supplied with worthy
 pastors. Auchreddy, now New Deer, was disjoined from Old
 Deer and a church built there in 1622.⁴⁶ Longside church
 first called New Peter was built in 1620, the parish which
 it was to serve being erected out of those of Peterhead and
 Crimond.⁴⁷ This same year Strichen church was built and
 became the centre of a separate parish carved out of Rathen
 and Fraserburgh in 1627.⁴⁸ The parish of Ordiquhill was
 disjoined from that of Fordyce in 1622, while in 1634 the
 parish of Inverböyndie was separated from that of Banff.⁴⁹
 The church at Pitsligo was built in 1630 and its parish
 disjoined from the parish of Aberdour, was erected by
 Parliament in 1633.⁵⁰ Other churches which we know to have
 been built during the episcopate of Patrick Forbes were these

39 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 p 103.

40 ib p 120.

41 ib p 148.

~~42 Maxwell~~

43 ib p 126.

44 ib p 114.

45 ib p 107.

46 ib p 218.

47 ib p 226: cf Antiquities of Aberdeen and Banff 1 p 411.

48 ib p 243 ib 3 p 391-2

49 ib p 291.

50 ib p 278.

51 ib p 234.

at Banchory- Devenick and Fraserburgh. The former was built by a Robert Buchan and the latter by Sir Alexander Fraser of Philorth. Nor have we as yet exhausted the notable parochial achievements which took place under Bishop Forbes. Greyfriars church in the burgh of Aberdeen, vacant since the Reformation and in a state of dire neglect, was repaired, and as there was no fund for the maintenance of a minister, under a happy arrangement the living was supplied by the new Professor of Divinity in Marischal College.⁵⁴ In 1631 a successful effort was made to raise sufficient funds for a minister at St Clement's, Footdee, which had likewise fallen into disuse and decay. The church was shortly repaired and Alexander Ross became its first post-Reformation incumbent. ~~The cathedral church of St Machar had been restored so far as was necessary about 1607~~⁵⁶ Forbes & his Session presented it with three bells. These undertakings were advanced by the liberal contributions of noble men who lived in the surrounding district - Forbes himself is said to have given generously towards the bells, but unfortunately ~~the cathedral was in ruin~~ during the purge of Aberdeen⁵⁷ in 1640 the cathedral was badly desecrated by the Covenanters.

52 ib p 73.

53 Antiquities of Aberdeen and Banff. 1 p 431.

54 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 p 8.

55 ib p 27.

56 Kennedy: Annals 2 p 343: Records of Old Aberdeen 2 p 134. 297.

57 Gordon: op cit 3 p 243: Fasti Aberdonenses p XLVII.

146

Those who have written of Patrick Forbes have not made apparent the amount of building nor the extent of the parochial re-organisation which he either directed or inspired, though Garden has, in passing, paid a brief⁵⁸ tribute to it. Amongst the Bishops of the First Scottish Episcopate there was not one who tackled the Home Mission problem with greater zeal, courage or success. We may note as additional signs of a more healthy religious life in the diocese of Patrick Forbes, the printing of a pocket edition of the Book of Common Order complete with Calendar⁵⁹ and Psalms set to music, by Raban in 1625 and a few years later the successful insistence of the Synod that Fair Days within the diocese should be altered to prevent their⁶⁰ frequent falling upon a Sunday.

There is also evidence that the Bishop fully shared the interest and the vision of the early Reformers with regard to the education of the young.⁶¹ He would appear to have realised that the success of a university depends not only upon its own efficiency, but also upon its ability to draw

58 Garden² 9 p 3.

59 Kennedy: Annals 1 p 175: Edmond: The Aberdeen Printers p XXIV.

60 RPC (2nd series) 4 p 88,89,99.

61 cf Chapter 11.

upon a constant supply of promising scholars, Knox's scheme of juvenile education had never materialised owing to the lack of resources and eventually in 1616 a definite attempt was made to establish a system of parish schools. In that year the Privy Council directed that "in every parish of this kingdom where convenient means may be had for establishing a school, a school shall be erected and a fit person appointed to teach in the same upon the expense of the parishoners according to the quality and quantity of the parish." This enactment of the Privy Council, at the instance of Archbishop Spottiswoode, was ratified in the Parliament of 1633 with an important addition- that the Bishops "in their several visitations shall have power with the consent of the heritors and the most part of the parishoners" and if the heritor refuse to co-operate, "could with the consent of the majority of the parishoners set down a stent on the land" for the maintenance of a parish school. Under this Act we find Bishop Forbes immediately active though he was at the time grievously ill. On 22nd November this same year, 1633, he issued to Andrew Strachan and the Presbytery of Alford a mandate commissioning them to

62 BUK p 60 etc: AP 4 p 94: Morgan: The Rise and Progress of Scottish Education p 51 f.

63 RPC (1st series) 10 p 671.

64 AP 5 p21-2.

act upon his behalf in the establishment of a school there. The record makes it clear that had the Bishop been able he would have travelled to Alford to attend to the matter in person.⁶⁵

In conclusion mention must be made of one respect in which the good and great Bishop of Aberdeen was apparently not before his time. The one seemingly black mark against his name is that we find him party to the common curse of witch-baiting.⁶⁶ At Aberdeen in 1630 several persons were suspected of witchcraft and the Privy Council was requested to commission a court of justice. In order that this might be obtained the more readily the declaration of Marion Hardy, an old woman, was taken upon oath and with great solemnity, in the presence of the Bishop, the leading ministers, and the magistrates of Aberdeen.⁶⁷ This resulted in a trial before the Sheriff and his deputies, the Provost and Baillies of the burgh, which ended with the imposition of the usual harsh punishment. Several of the accused because of the cruelty meted out to them, died before the trial took place.⁶⁸ In

65 Antiquities of Aberdeen and Banff 4 p 136, 137.

66 Mathieson: op cit 1 p 194-200 cf RPC (2nd series) 3 p 104, 293, 381.

67 Kennedy: Annals 1 p 172: RPC (2nd series) 4 p 13.

68 RPC (2nd series) 4 p 39.

fairness to Forbes, however, it ought to be added that it was customary for preliminary proceedings against witches to be conducted by the church and that there is nothing to show whether he actually shared the crude convictions of his generation regarding witches, or whether he felt bound on this occasion to enter into proceedings against them as being in themselves the source of much superstition and unrest. All we do know is that Forbes was frequently at pains to combat superstitions. Certainly we hear of no further instances of the Bishop's participation in the conviction of these innocent but misguided people and there is an illuminating entry in the Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen which reads thus: "The Bishop and Session ⁶⁹order Patrick Bodie to make public confession after sermon for consulting with witches".⁷⁰ Whatever may have been Forbes's views about witchcraft it seems that he had no wish to prosecute or to persecute but preferred to bring a man back to a sane and normal outlook by a charitable exercise of discipline.

69 Calderwood 3 p 299: Spalding Miscellany 1 p 185-7:
Selections from Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen p 191.
70 Selections from the Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen p 87.

Chapter Vlll

Bishop Patrick Forbes and The Colleges of Aberdeen.

About six years after his consecration as Bishop of Aberdeen Elphinstone obtained in 1494 from Pope Alexander VI a Bull which having set forth the rude and savage condition of the north erected in the city of Old Aberdeen a studium generale for theology, canon and civil law, medicine, the liberal arts and any other lawful faculty to be studied and taught by ecclesiastical and lay masters and doctors in the same manner as in the studia generalia of Paris and Bologna. Ten years later the Bishop grafted into the University a collegiate body which he founded and endowed for teaching the several faculties and for the service of the church which he founded in immediate connection with his University. To this foundation James IV contributed a partial endowment and in association with the monarch it came to be known as The King's College of Aberdeen to which Elphinstone soon attracted several celebrated men who had been his associates in foreign schools-¹men like Hector Boece, Arthur Boece and William Hay.

- 1 First Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts (London 1874) p 200 Evidence Taken and Received by the Commissioners for Visiting the Universities (1837) 4 p 129: Rait: The Universities of Aberdeen p 26-32.

In Elphinstone's charter provision was made for thirty-six persons excluding the Chancellor and Rector. These thirty-six were the Principal, Canonist, Civilist, Mediciner, sub-Principal, Grammararian, five students in theology, thirteen bursars, eight Prebendaries and four Choristers. The duties of the Principal embraced the Government of the College and the delivery of lectures on theology, preaching and discipline. The students in theology had first to graduate in arts and during their theological course they acted as regents over the students in arts. To the Chancellor, who was always to be the Bishop of Aberdeen, Elphinstone wisely reserved a visitatorial and dictatorial power and he had the right to nominate the Principal, Canonist, Civilist, Mediciner, sub-Principal² and Grammararian.

Under Bishop Dunbar's Foundation of 1529 there were certain modifications. The officials formerly appointed by the Chancellor were now to be elected, the latter formally admitting with the right to veto. Additional endowments allowed Dunbar to add six more members to Elphinstone's thirty-six and to increase the number of students in theology from five to six.

- 2 Evidence Taken and Received ib p 135-9: Rait: op cit p 33-7, 58-9: Fasti Aberdonenses p XVI-XVII: It should be noted that the Chancellor and Rector are University officers while the Principal is Principal Regent a College officer. Almost all writers in Scotland are loose about the distinction owing to the fact that so often the College became really identical with the University.

The Principal was to rule the College, maintain the buildings, keep good discipline and to do a restricted amount of lecturing, while only certain students in theology were to be selected as regents in the arts. For the repair of the buildings £40 money of that period was to be paid annually by the Procurator together with the casualties of vacant stipends and £5 annually was to be set aside for the upkeep of the attached manses.³ That this had not been done was the main cause of the trouble under Bishop Patrick Forbes in 1619. After Dunbar's death officials became lax and the standard of teaching and discipline fell. There was a good deal of dilapidation and financial trouble and as the Reformation⁴ approached it became quite impossible to arrest the decline.

According to the First Book of Discipline which aimed at placing the Scottish Universities on a sound practical footing, the duties of the Principal, Rector and other officials were to be re-arranged and in addition to Divinity, Greek and Hebrew, Mathematics, Ethics, Economics, Politics, Civil Law and Natural Philosophy were to be taught, Canon Law dropping out of the curriculum with the Reformation. At Aberdeen⁵ University it was planned to have forty-eight bursars.

³ ib p 141-151, 228.

⁴ Fasti Aberdonenses p XXV f: Rait: op cit p 86-90, 100.

⁵ Knox 2 p 213-221.

Though Andrew Melville was able to put into operation some of the ideals of the First Book of Discipline at Glasgow and St Andrews, at Aberdeen nothing definite was accomplished. Arbuthnot its Principal who was closely associated with Melville was ready for reform, but nothing came of attempts to secure a new Foundation. This failure led to the founding of Aberdeen's other College- Marischal- to which reference will be made later.

There was stern opposition probably led by the Canonist, Civilist and Mediciner whose offices were to be abolished and a Nova Fundatio was not produced until 1597. This document which embodied the previous recommendations was apparently prepared by David Rait who had become Principal in 1592. It stated that the King was anxious to place King's College on an equal footing with the Universities of Glasgow and St Andrews. Ancient grants were confirmed; new endowments were conferred. The members of the College were restricted to twenty-two, the Principal, four regents, twelve bursars, a Grammararian, an Economist, a Cook and two servants. The Principal, in addition to his ordinary duties of management was to hold the incumbency of St Machar's and to act as Professor of Theology. The offices of Canonist, Civilist and Mediciner were abolished. Under the revised curriculum not only Canon and Civil Law and Medicine but also Physics

6 Rait: op cit p 107 f: Fasti Aberdonenses p XXXI-IV.

7 Rait: op cit p III; Gordon: op cit 2 p 156-7: Adderson Officers and Graduates p 25.

and Metaphysics would cease to be taught. In addition to the various officials of the College together with the Chancellor and Rector of the University, the Principals of the Colleges of St Andrews and Edinburgh and the ministers of New Aberdeen were to participate in the choice of a Principal. The Rector was to be elected according to the old university system of "nations".

From this time Patrick Forbes must have been familiar with, and interested in the affairs of King's College. He returned to the locality and Laird of Corse in 1598 and was minister at Keith from 1612, while his son, the future Doctor John Forbes, was a student there for several years after 1606. As Bishop of Aberdeen he came to the University as its Chancellor at a most difficult and critical time. The New Foundation had never received Parliamentary sanction but since it had enjoyed the backing of the King and had actually come very near to insertion in the Statute Book,¹⁰ it carried a certain weight. It could not however be strictly enforced for nobody could be too sure in the circumstances to which Foundation the College was expected or entitled to

8 Anderson: Studies in the History and Development of the University of Aberdeen p 37 Rait; op cit p 113-7.

9 Garden & 19 p 6: Fasti Aberdonenses p LXXII: Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 179. of RMS VI No 1684.

10 Gordon: op cit 2 p 156.

conform. An Act of Parliament in 1617 did nothing to clarify the situation for it merely ratified "all the foundations and donations made to the College with its¹¹ privileges". Chancellors had lacked interest and had been inactive and between 1592 and 1618 only one Rector had been¹² appointed. Principal David Rait was not a very vigorous¹³ leader. Leitch spoke of him as "oppressed with age and cares" and even a capable Principal with so many varied duties on his hands could hardly have done justice to his theology lectures and Rait had most certainly not done justice to the¹⁴ financial and administrative side of his work. The Royal Warrant for a visitation of the University in 1619 spoke of "dilapidation and the unnecessary and idle spending and wasting of the proper rent and patrimony" of both Aberdeen Colleges, "the ruin and decay of the buildings and edifices within the same, the neglect of the ordinary teaching..... and constitutions established within the said Colleges..... the professors are become careless and negligent. The number of professors and founded persons is not fully complete and all good order and government within the said Colleges

- 11 AP 4 p 576: Evidence Taken and Received 4 p 152-3.
- 12 Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 8.
- 13 Rait: op cit p 129.
- 14 cf later; Botfield: op cit 2 p 634.

is become in contempt".

This warrant had been granted by King James VI on the plea and advice of the new Chancellor who had been immediately active in the affairs of his University. James had been wavering between the old and new Foundations but Forbes persuaded the King to empower him to revive the old Foundation of Bishop Elphinstone.¹⁶ We are told that the Nova Fundatio of 1597 coming into his hands "with a supplication to set it anew on foot",¹⁷ Forbes took it and burnt it and that though other proposals were to hand for altering the whole foundation of the College "the Chancellor caused set the old Foundation on foot as far as it could subsist with the Protestant religion".¹⁸ Patrick Forbes's work at King's College as Chancellor of the University consisted in little more than reviving Elphinstone's Foundation and making it work, except that some offices were unnecessary with the change in religion and one important new office was instituted. This in itself, however, was no mean achievement when we consider the conditions which Forbes had to face and it stands to his credit that he was able to apply the old system in such

15 Fasti Aberdonenses p 273: RPC (1st series) 11 p 547.

16 Anderson: Studies in the History and Development of the University of Aberdeen p 37.

17 Gordon: op cit 2 p 156.

18 ib: cf Spalding: op cit 1 p 95.

756
a way as to make sound learning ~~and~~ new religion flourish in the north.

The warrant for the visitation placed Forbes at the head of the commission and empowered any seven, the chairman being always one, to constitute a quorum.¹⁹ The commissioners received full powers to remedy any defects. Within the scope of the law they could take what steps they pleased in order to see that the fabrics were repaired, the teaching corrected, the various rents and emoluments properly administered, the numerous abuses reformed and were only under obligation to report what had been done to the Privy Council.²⁰ Forbes presided over the meetings of the commissioners and their decisions would appear to have been very largely his work. Those who served on the committee would appear to have been carefully selected as men who would work with the Chancellor who was not hampered by a University Court or Senate, by ordinances or the hard and fast ruling of a General Assembly. The initiative was deliberately, and at his own request, put into his hands and unhesitatingly and unflinchingly he used it for the welfare of both church and college which he had so much at heart.

19 RPC (1st series) 11 p 548: Botfield: op cit 2 p 633: Fasti Aberdonenses p 273.

20 RPC (1st series) 11 p 547-8: RMS VII No 2011.

The meetings of the commissioners took place in mid-September 1619.²¹ They found the University in a bad way- the Chancellor had not exaggerated his case to James VI and the strong wording of the Royal Warrant was abundantly justified. The Canonist had naturally disappeared after the Reformation but with him had gone the Civilist and Mediciner and the only officials who appeared before the commissioners were Principal David Rait, sub-Principal Patrick Guthrie and three regents. They were called upon to table legal proof of their appointment. Not one of them could do so for "formal and canonical election had fallen away". The teaching was found to be quite unsatisfactory and the Principal in particular was found to have been deficient. He had not taught "as is prescribed by the Foundation" and the whole of the previous year had taught "nothing but some few precepts of Hebrew Grammar and for practice thereof only the first Psalm". The financial state of Kings College was even more discouraging. The Principal had undertaken the Procuratorship in defiance of rulings to the contrary,²² and had

21 Fasti Aberdonenses p 276.

22 In Elphinstone's Foundation the office of Principal and Procurator were distinctly and deliberately separate. Upon the Procurator fell the duties of management and the Principal was supposed to check the former's accounts. In the New Foundation the office of Procurator was joined to that of the Econumus who had been introduced at the time of Galloway's Visitation in 1549 and given charge over foods and accounts. cf Rait: op cit p 35,90,115.

mishandled the College revenues. Rait had "not only been negligent but also harmful", for he had granted feus upon too easy terms whereby "the yearly revenues of the said College was reduced to small importance and as he alleged was presently three thousand pounds in his debt". Some little while later Forbes informed the King that matters were so desperate that in order to put the College on a sound footing it would be necessary to invoke the royal laws for the recovery of teinds²³ "sacrilegiously sold".

But this was not all. The promotion silver- a graduation levy- had been diverted for private use and various other regulations had been disregarded. All the members were not living within the precincts and the gate ~~was~~ not kept as it should have been, by a bursar, but by a porter "hired and feed". The buildings were found to be in a shocking state of disrepair and no money had been set aside for their upkeep. The churches which had been incorporat~~ed~~ with the University were not supplied with ministers and the commissioners found "lamentable heathenism and such lowness as is horrible to record, albeit²⁴ even about the cathedral kirk of the Diocese".

The old Foundation expressly stated that if the College fell into poverty through the negligence of the Principal his

23 Botfield: op cit 2 p 633.

24 Fasti Aberdonenses p 275-6: Rait: op cit p 125-6.

159

25

obligation was to make good its estate. Rather than proceed to a sentence against Rait, the commissioners came to an arrangement with him. Before Michaelmas 1621 the Principal was to repair the buildings, furnish the College where essential furnishings were lacking and supply the Collegiate churches with clergy to the satisfaction of the Bishop. The commissioners were nothing if not thorough. Workmen were at once appointed to see what was necessary in the way of repairs and equipment and a small sub-committee headed by Patrick Forbes was to see that Rait fulfilled his obligations. In addition the latter undertook to free the College of all debt by Michaelmas 1623, failing which it was agreed that he should pay two thousand merks and forfeit any amounts which the College might owe him.

26

Bishop Patrick Forbes was not disposed to let Rait off lightly and he showed a good deal of righteous indignation. Writing to the King early the following year, 1620, he says: "As your Highness's pleasure must be a law to us, so wish I heartily that your Majesty understood particularly the distress of that poor house through the abominable dilapidation of the means mortified thereto by miserable men, who in bad times, not

25 ib p 277.

26 ib p 277, 282: Rait: op cit p 127.

being controlled have so securely sacked all that estate, as if neither a God had been in heaven to count with, nor men on earth to examine their ways"²⁷. Four years after the visitation on 20th November 1623 the commissioners led by Forbes again met and had Principal Rait before them to see if he had carried out his side of the agreement. The record of this meeting ends suddenly after giving a list of the repairs compiled by the workmen appointed in 1619 without telling us to what extent Rait had fulfilled his obligations.²⁸

Apparently the Principal satisfied the commissioners for he²⁹ was not removed and retained his office until his death in 1632. In fairness to Rait it should be stressed that the fault was by no means all his: he was not the only official who had been careless or negligent and since the Reformation the College had been given no satisfactory or authorised system of teaching or administration. This was clearly understood at the time and in his letter to the King Forbes does not put the blame all on one man, but refers to the negligence of "miserable men". At the Reformation Aberdeen had suffered in common with the church and other universities and some of the teinds to which Forbes refers as having been "sacrilegiously sold" must have been lost before Rait's time. Rait was a good scholar.

27 Botfield: op cit 2 p 634.

28 Fasti Aberdonenses p 280-3: Rait; op cit p 128.

29 Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 26.

He was the first post-Reformation Doctor of Divinity at
 Aberdeen³⁰ and Leitch referred to him not only as 'venerabilem'
 but also as 'clarissimum'.³¹ The failure of the Nova Fundatio,
 which we are told he prepared, to secure the ratification of
 the Estates may have discouraged a man whose bent was in the
 direction of scholarship rather than the care of administration.
 We may assume that in 1619 and again in 1623, if by that time,
 as is possible, Rait had not fulfilled all that was required
 of him, Bishop Patrick Forbes took these circumstances into
 account and allowed the Principal to continue in office.

The Bishop was also interested in the other Aberdeen College
 which was situated in the new town and the Warrant which he
 procured from the King in 1619 ordered a visitation of both
 Colleges. Marischal College owed its origin to the failure
 of the Melville party to introduce the Nova Fundatio into
 King's College and so stay the insidious progress of Romanism
 in that foundation. The new College received its Charter in
 1593 and its particular object was to increase learning in
 the humane arts.³² Provision was made for a Principal, three
 regents, six bursars, a Steward and Cook who were to live in

30 Funerals p 386: Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 p 18.

31 ib.

32 Evidence Taken and Received 4 ii p 235-9: AP 4 p 35:
 Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 324 f Rait: op cit
 p 249-252.

the building. In addition to the cares of management the Principal had to fulfil the duties of a Professor and teach Scripture, Hebrew and Syria³³e. The three regents were to be restricted to a subject or group of subjects which were minutely defined- a stipulation which does not appear to have been observed until the middle of the 18th century.³⁴ The head of the College was the Earl Marischal with whom rested all appointments, examination and admission resting with certain officials and ministers. There was to be no leasing of lands or feus but this regulation was soon broken to the detriment of the foundation.³⁵

It is thus apparent that Patrick Forbes had not the same authority in Marischal College as he had in King's, but he realised the necessity for raising the standard in both colleges more especially as students passed from the one to the other and the Royal Warrant of 1619 gave him the power to intervene.³⁶ The Bishops[^], predecessor, Alexander Forbes had evidently regarded the teaching and management of Marischal College as highly unsatisfactory³⁷ for[^] in 1618 Andrew Aidy (who had become its Principal in 1615)³⁸ wrote to inform the King that

33 Anderson: Records of Marischal College (NSC 1889) 1 p 43, 63
 34 In the Foundation Charter we read: "Regentes ad novas professiones transilire non debent" of Evidence Taken and Received 4th p 288. of Chapter II.
 35 Rait: op cit p 260.
 36 Fasti Aberdonenses. p 332
 37 c+RPC (1st series) 11 p 547-8.
 38 Rait: op cit p 267.

Alexander Forbes wished to deprive him, maliciously alleging that the latter wished to substitute his own son, ³⁹ ~~also named~~ John Forbes, at this time a regent in King's College. ⁴⁰ James however paid no attention to Aidy's accusations and the Royal Warrant empowered the Commissioners to enter Marischal with the same powers as they had in Kings. ⁴¹ There was a good deal of jealousy between the two establishments and the fact that the Principal of the latter had a voice in the election of the officials of the former accentuated this feeling between the old and the new foundations. ⁴²

The desire of Bishop ^{Patrick} Forbes to bring the two colleges of his cathedral town into line was thus bitterly resented and Aidy backed by the Earl Marischal refused to admit the ⁴³ commissioners. ⁴⁴ For a while there was a deadlock. But Forbes was determined upon the investigation and informed the Earl Marischal that he was quite willing for him to do the work himself and that he would be content merely to forward his report. If, however, the Earl would not be reasonable he would exercise his powers to see the task completed. Upon this show of determination the Earl agreed to undertake the required

39 Botfield: op cit 2 p 389-390.

40 Anderson: Officers and Graduates. ^{ps4}

41 RPC (1st series) 11 p 547-8.

42 Rait: op cit p 259, 338-9.

43 Fasti Aberdonenses p 278-280: Rait: op cit p 267.

44 Botfield: op cit 2 p 634.

investigation and invited the Bishop to assist him. This invitation was accepted and the upshot was that Principal Aidy, the chief stumbling block to the desired reform was removed from his post.⁴⁵

Patrick Forbes was interested in the Colleges of Aberdeen first and foremost because of the opportunities they afforded for the training of the future clergy. In the Diocese of Aberdeen morals and religion were at a low ebb and there was a deplorable shortage of clergy. The doctrines of Rome were daily making insidious headway amongst the superstitious and half-educated common folk. The Chancellor was interested in the University not only as Chancellor but as Bishop and almost all his reforms are to be explained with reference to his diocesan policy.⁴⁶

The First Book of Discipline had stressed the need for teachers of Divinity in the universities,⁴⁷ but owing to the wholesale appropriation of church patrimony and the uncertainties of the time, these did not materialise. At Glasgow the Principal

45 ib.

46 Anderson: Studies in the History and Development of the University of Aberdeen p 40: Wodrow: op cit p 97-8: Garden §, 10 p 3: Antiquities of Aberdeen and Banff 1 p 167.

47 Knox 2 p 213 f.

taught Theology until the Chair of Divinity was created in 1641,⁴⁸
 while at Edinburgh the Principal became Professor of Theology
 in 1587 and the posts were held in conjunction⁴⁹ until 1620 when
 a separate Professor of Divinity was appointed. At Marischal
 College the Principal was responsible for instruction in Hebrew and
 the Scriptures and undertook the teaching of Theology until 1617
 when Doctor William Forbes was appointed a Reader by the Aberdeen
 Town Council.⁵⁰ At King's College the situation was equally
 unsatisfactory.⁵¹ In the exposition of Theology the University
 of St Andrews, where Andrew Melville had, as Principal of St
 Mary's College, laboured so assiduously, led the way. After
 1579 St Mary's had become a Divinity College and its Principal⁵²
 had the assistance of two others in the instruction of Theology.
 It was here that Patrick Forbes had studied under Melville
 himself. Melville had made a deep impression on the youthful
 scholar and Forbes's first concern on becoming Bishop was to
 establish a similar system of theological instruction in Aberdeen.
 The first step was obviously to institute a Chair of Divinity and
 the manner in which the Bishop did this must mark him out as one

48 Munimenta Almae Universitatis Glasguensis 2 p 304, 456.

49 Bower: History of the University of Edinburgh 1 p 102, 141.

50 Anderson: Records of Marischal College 1 p 43, 63, 156 f.

51 cf supra.

52 Wodrow: op cit p 82: McCrie: Life of Melville 1 p 242, 252.

of the greatest administrators in the annals of the Scottish Church.

It has been surmised by a very notable authority on the history of Aberdeen University that the Chair of Divinity in King's College was one of the results of the commissioners work in 1619.⁵³ Since the commission affirmed that the Principal had been negligent in the teaching of Theology this⁵⁴ would on the face of it appear to be a reasonable deduction. But Professor G D Henderson has shown that such was not the case and that Bishop Patrick Forbes had already moved in the matter. Attention has already been drawn to the fact that the commissioners met in mid-September 1619, but Henderson has referred us to a minute of the Synod of Aberdeen in April of that year which makes apparent the prior initiative of the Bishop. The minute ran thus: "Anent the matter of support and contribution to be given by the ministry of the diocese of Aberdeen for the foundation of two divines at Aberdeen to the which the whole ministry condescended, Mr James Ross and Dr Forbes for Aberdeen... (here follow the names of representatives of the other Presbyteries of the Synod).....are appointed by the Bishop and Synod for to travel with ilk brother of their Presbytery

53 Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 68.

54 cf Fasti Aberdonenses p 276.

concerning the same contribution and they do report their diligence of the same to the said Bishop betwixt and Whitsunday next",⁵⁵ Henderson points out that at this time the expression⁵⁶ "divines" was commonly used to designate professors or doctors. There was apparently no discussion of the matter at the October Synod, but a special committee consisting of representatives of the various Presbyteries was appointed to deliberate with the Bishop on weighty matters and it seems to have been under this arrangement that the advertisement of the proposed Professorship was issued in the name of the Synod in December of this same⁵⁷ year, 1619.

The appointment of the new Chair was made in April 1620 by⁵⁸ the Bishop and Synod. The choice of the Bishop's own son Doctor John Forbes was an excellent one made strictly according to merit. There was no question of paternal sentiment securing an unworthy or inferior nomination. The Bishop had every justification for believing his son to be the most suitable man for the post. Of the first Professor of Divinity in King's

55 Henderson: Religious Life in 17th Century Scotland p 37

56 ib.

57 ib p 38. J Forbes: Disputationes Theologicae Duae (1620). Preface. This was the thesis presented by Dr John Forbes in connection with the Professorship and it was on the strength of it that he was awarded the degree of Doctor of Divinity.

58 J Forbes: ib.

College Irving wrote: "In this important vocation he laboured with great diligence and speedily acquired the character of a most able and useful teacher. He was profoundly skilled in ecclesiastical antiquity and not content with delivering what is called a system of divinity he exhibited a very elaborate deduction of the progress of Christian doctrine in various ages of the church.....Nor did he neglect to instruct his students in practical religion; one division of his lectures related to moral theology, another to the pastoral care and to residence".⁵⁹

The good Bishop walked by faith: he did not wait until all the necessary money for endowment came in before he established the Professorship. In Ellon Presbytery records under the year 1621 there is an entry instructing one of the ministers to make payment "to the divine" under pain of suspension. In October 1620 the Synod ordered the moderator of the Presbytery of Deer to produce by 16th November five ~~marks~~ each from various ministers "due to the divine". Again in October 1623 the minutes of the Presbytery of Fordyce contain the entry: "Item that the whole Presbyteries send in their subsynod anent the foundation of the Divinity⁶⁰ Professor". The Bishop himself, we are told, contributed generously towards the necessary funds⁶¹

59 Irving: op cit 2 p 46-7.

60 Henderson: op cit p 37-38.

61 Garden § 9 p 3: Wodrow: op cit p 97.

and within six years he was able to see the Chair in the founding of which he had taken the initiative, suitably endowed. On 20th January 1626 there was a contract between the Bishop's brother, William Forbes of Craigievar, the Bishop and the moderators of the various Presbyteries of the diocese whereby "on the narrative that the said Bishop and moderators had mortified the sum of 10,000 merks Scots to the Professor of Divinity of the said College.....the said William Forbes in consideration of the said sum of 10,000 merks, disposes to them the lands of Cairnadrane, mill, mill lands, multures etc and salmon fishing on the Don, lying in the parish of Kinnellar, burdened with the yearly payment of 6 pounds 13 shillings and 4 pence; and grants also the teind sheaves of the said lands". Thus through the good offices of his wealthy brother the Bishop was able to secure a sound and useful investment for the upkeep of the Divinity Chair. This endowment still contributes towards the support of the Chair which Forbes founded though the sum is not large and fluctuates from year to year.

62 Fasti Aberdonenses p 143-4: RMS LX No 1102: Anderson Officers and Graduates p 68.

63 Rait: op cit p 129. Rait says that in recent times this endowment still brought in over £400 per annum. The income from Cairnadrane or Cairntradlin was never so high as this in the 17th Century. In 1816 it was less than £200 & according to The University of Aberdeen Abstract of Accounts in 1936 it was £73; in 1937 only £4; in 1938 £189.

The regulations for the new Chair were borrowed by Forbes⁶⁴ from the practice of the French Reformed Church. The election to the Chair was vested in the moderator of the Provincial Synod with two delegates from each of the eight Presbyteries of which it was composed together with the Dean of Theology in King's and one other member of that College specially chosen by the collegiate body to have a voice in the election. The candidate thus elected was to be admitted by the Bishop and the commissioners of the⁶⁵ Presbyteries.

Once a Professor of Divinity had been instituted the Bishop set about ensuring that there would be a continuous supply of promising men for the work of the ministry in his diocese. One of the findings of the commissioners during their investigations was that bursaries had not been properly⁶⁶ administered and Forbes was anxious to secure more adequate⁶⁷ bursaries for the support of students in Theology at Aberdeen. The General Assembly which met at Aberdeen in 1616 had agreed

- 64 Fasti Aberdonenses p 157: Campbell: The Discipline or Book of Order in the Reformed Churches of France (1924) 2. 3.: Quick: Synodicon 1 p 106, 229. cf Henderson: op cit pp. 39, 248.
- 65 Fasti Aberdonenses p 143-4: Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 68-9: Kennedy: Annals of Aberdeen 2 p 377.
- 66 Fasti Aberdonenses p 276.
- 67 Garden 2 10 p 3.

that every diocese should supply bursaries for the support of
 two divinity students at St Andrews. The minutes of the
 Presbytery of Deer for October 1617 and 1618 show that the
 Synod working through the Presbyteries had co-operated in
 this scheme. After the foundation of the Divinity Chair
 in King's College, the minutes of the same Presbytery for
 October 1620 reveal that the Bishop induced the Synod to
 divert the funds which it raised for the upkeep of bursars

69

at St Andrews to support theological students at Aberdeen. It should be
 noted that under Forber's arrangement students of Divinity studied both at King's & at Marischal, the
 rival Colleges being to this extent united.
 And with the consent of his clergy the Bishop set up synodical

Canons calculated to raise the standard of examination both
 in respect of literary qualifications and moral conduct for
 candidates for the ministry. The success of the Bishop's

70

policy in ~~the two~~ Colleges is to be judged by the increase in

71

the supply of clergy and by the fact that at the time of the
 National Covenant Aberdeen was famous for its theological
 school, while the majority of clergy and students sided with
 their teachers in opposition to the Covenanters.

72

68 BUK p 1124, 1129: Calderwood 7. p 230 f.

69 Henderson: op cit p 39.

70 Garden § 10 p 3.

71 cf Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 passim and Anderson;
 Officers and Graduates p 182-7: Garden § 9 p 3.

72 Gordon History of Scots Affairs 1 p 91 f: 3 p 220.

In order to give prestige to the University setting it on a level with the English Universities and to encourage sound learning, Bishop Forbes revived the old mediaeval academic honour of a Doctorate in Divinity, while Doctor John Forbes strongly defended the degree. ⁷³ ~~but find doctors mentioned and encouraged as specialists in doctrine in~~ Calvin's New Ecclesiastical Constitution for Geneva 1541-42 and Knox had no objection to such ⁷⁴ doctors. This distinction had been expressly recognised by the early General Assemblies and the Second Book of Discipline following Calvin had elevated doctors into a class of their own. ⁷⁵ In 1586 the Assembly declared that voting was to be confined to pastors, ~~doctors and elders~~ ^{These doctors were, however, teachers, not holders of a degree,} and no doctorates were conferred in Scotland for over fifty years after the Reformation. The extreme Presbyterians were openly and violently opposed to the degree while many regarded it as a breach of the fundamental doctrine of the parity of ministers ⁷⁶ and as a device of the Bishops. ⁷⁷ Calderwood spoke of the degree ⁷⁸

73 Garden V. 2. p 28.

74 Irenicum (1646) Liber 2: cap. XI p 458 f.

75 Kidd: Documents of The Continental Reformation p 594 f.

76 Calderwood 2 p 478: BUK p 305, 495.

77 BUK p 560.

78 cf Kidd: op cit p 670. 673: Calvin: Institutes BK 4, iii, 4.

as "a novelty brought in without the advice of consent of the
⁷⁹ kirk". Row referred to "an hierarchical doctor" as "the
⁸⁰ prelate's eldest son and heir" and the text "Be ye not called
doctors" was freely quoted against the degree when it was
⁸¹ revived.

The revival of the Doctorate of Divinity was apparently first
⁸² suggested in 1607 by Archbishop Gladstones of St Andrews, but
it was not until 1616 that King James VI authorised the
⁸³ conferring of it in that University. One of the earliest
recipients was William Forbes, who became Principal of Marischal
⁸⁴ College and first Bishop of Edinburgh. The first Doctorate
in King's College was bestowed in 1620 upon David Rait its
Principal, while in the same year John Forbes received the
⁸⁵ honour on the strength of his inaugural ~~dis~~putation.
Amongst those who received the degree under Chancellor Patrick
Forbes were William Guild, who joined the Covenanters and
⁸⁶ became Rector of King's College in 1639 and Andrew Strachan
who succeeded Doctor John Forbes in the Chair of Divinity in
⁸⁷ 1634 but who died at an early age the following year.⁸⁸ The

79 Calderwood 7 p 222.

80 Row p 261, 318.

81 Irenicum (1646) l. p458.

82 Garden 2 p 28: Sprott: Scottish Liturgies of the Reign
of James VI p XVI.

83 RPC (1st series) 11 p 182 (n) Sprott: ~~16~~: Calderwood
7 p 222.

84 RPC. ib. Henderson: op cit p 41.

85 Henderson: op cit p 42: Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 p 14.

86 Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 10.

87 Aberdeen University Review (December 1934).

88 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 p 151.

most famous recipients of the doctorate in the time of Bishop Forbes, however, was that group of scholars known as "The Aberdeen Doctors" who were six in number and who formed the most formidable opposition that the Covenanters had to face in 1638.⁸⁹ Three of them were Professors in the University: Doctor John Forbes, the leader and propagandist of the party, Doctor Robert Baron and Doctor William Leslie, and the others Doctor James Sibbald, Doctor Alexander Scroggie and Doctor Alexander Ross were ministers in the burgh.⁹⁰ These were the men who honoured their great Bishop at his death in 1635 and who were without their equals for holiness of life and learning.⁹¹ Under Bishop Patrick Forbes there was nothing honorary about the degree of doctor. The thesis which merited the distinction had to be distributed and defended against all comers "ab aurora ad vesperam".⁹²⁹³

As a pupil of Andrew Melville's Patrick Forbes could not have favoured the old method of teaching whereby the regent took his class through the whole curriculum.⁹⁴ The Nova

89 Gordon: op cit l. p 81 f: Kennedy: op cit l p 199: Spalding: op cit l p 59-62 Guthry: Memoirs p 38.
90 Garden p 27: McMillan: The Aberdeen Doctors p 45, 227-263.
91 Funerals p 73, 78, 87, 161 etc.
92 Garden § 42 p 20 & 47 p 25 & 48 p 25 & 49 p 25 & 50 p 25 & 53 p 27: Gordon: op cit 3 p 220 Grub 3 p 14 f.
93 Henderson: op cit p 43.
94 cf Rashdall: The Universities of Europe in The Middle Ages Vol. 2. Chapter LX.

Fundatio of 1597 had required the regents to concentrate upon
 one department only but by 1601 the old system of regenting⁹⁵
 was in operation and it is certain that until the session
 1627-28 regents continued to take their class through the
 whole arts course.⁹⁶ But in May 1628 there was a visitation
 of King's College by the Chancellor. Only one decision
 made by the visitors and that a comparatively unimportant
 one is known to us.⁹⁷ It seems likely that there were other
 decisions, one of which may have been to restrict the regents
 to a group of subjects in the interests of specialisation
 and efficiency. At any rate it would seem that from session
 1628-29 until shortly after the close of Forbes's episcopate,
 the regents were each responsible for a group of subjects-
 there was a degree of specialisation- for those regents who
 contributed to The Funerals styled themselves professors-
 David Leitch is Professor of Physiology and Lower Mathematics⁹⁸
 and John Lundie is Professor of Literae Humaniores.

Amongst the comparatively small number of students who
 passed through King's College during his Chancellorship of
 the University, Bishop Forbes sought in every way to make

95 Rait op cit p 114.

96 ib p 118-9.

97 Fasti Aberdonenses p 283.

98 Funerals p 22, 370, 383, 414. Evidence Taken and Received
 4 p 215.

sound learning flourish. Though his chief concern was for theological study he was sensible enough not to allow his interest to end there.⁹⁹ The commissioners of 1619 with the Bishop at their head took care in reviving the Old Foundation to appoint worthy and capable men to the offices which were vacant.¹⁰⁰ Just as he inspired theological learning so did the Bishop initiate and inspire reforms calculated to raise the standard of knowledge in all branches of study. Bursars who did not attend at the commencement of the session were to be deprived; students who did not attend their first year classes were to be severely examined before being allowed to proceed with their course and in addition the Grammararian was given an assistant to help him with the work of the Grammar School.¹⁰¹ Forbes revived Elphinstone's rule that, subject to the dispensation of the Chancellor or Rector, regents should hold office for six full years. All able students when they had completed the arts course were, while attending Theology lectures, to instruct their juniors in arts.¹⁰² The merit of this arrangement was that it would ensure continuous and up-to-date instruction and would serve to preserve the theological atmosphere. The modern conception of a professorial system with its various advantages, not

99 Garden & 9 p 3: Wodrow: op cit p 97.
 100 Fasti Aberdonenses p 278: Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 30, 31, 35.
 101 Rait: op cit p 139.
 102 Rait: op cit p 166: McMillan: The Aberdeen Doctors p 43.

least that of specialisation, was little understood in the time of Forbes, yet the Bishop sought to secure some measure of specialisation and continuity in teaching in the interests of efficiency. In 1634 three regents were censured for laxity in teaching and attendance, and steps were taken to ensure on the part of all regents a greater devotion to their duties, while for failing to fulfil his office in certain respects the Principal was carpeted before the Chancellor.¹⁰³ The epitaph on the Bishop's tombstone in St Machar's Churchyard, Old Aberdeen rightly describes him as "Instaurator studii generalis Aberdoniensis".¹⁰⁴ Like his great predecessor Elphinstone, Patrick Forbes understood the value of the severe mental discipline of a thorough grounding in arts and philosophy for those who sought the service of the ministry while at the same time he had the widest vision and realised that civilisation can only be enriched by education and culture.

We have seen how careful Bishop Forbes was to see that the buildings and fabric of King's College should be restored. In the spring of 1633 an extraordinary accident occurred to

103 Fasti Aberdonenses p 396, 397, 398.

104 Funerals p 3.

the College buildings. The royal crown which, since the days of James IV surmounted the keystones, was blown down during a heavy gale "whereby both the roofs of timber and lead and other adjacent works were pitifully crushed"¹⁰⁵. The Bishop desired to repair the damage without alteration of structure and it was owing to his exertions, assisted by Doctor William Gordon, Mediciner in King's College¹⁰⁶ who acted as architect that the repairs were speedily and satisfactorily concluded.¹⁰⁷

About the same time there is evidence that another noteworthy piece of work was being undertaken- the re-establishment of the library in King's College. There can be no doubt that Bishop Forbes inspired and encouraged this venture. The College library would appear to date from the time of Bishop Stewart 1532-1545 who is said not only to have built it but to have furnished it with a number of books chiefly missals and breviaries.¹⁰⁸ We hear no more of this establishment which probably fell into disuse at the time of the Reformation until the Chancellorship of Patrick Forbes.

- 105 Spalding: op cit 1 p 191.
- 106 Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 35.
- 107 Spalding: op cit 1 p 191: Gordon: op cit 3 p 128-9.
- 108 Calendar of Aberdeen University 1893-1894: Appendix on University Libraries: Rait: op cit p 326.

After the visitation undertaken by him in 1628 a stipulation was made to the effect that graduands should pay £4 (Scots) for books to the library and "the names of the said contributors to be subscribed in the said book or books".¹⁰⁹ Evidently books came in for in 1633 the first historian, Robert Ogilvie, one of the regents, appears.¹¹⁰ Two years later Andrew Strachan "left and mortified his whole books" to the library. Nothing is known of the library as it developed during the time of Bishop Forbes but the collection of books must have considerably increased, for in 1637 the Rectorial Court found a catalogue of the books to be essential.¹¹¹

The increase in the number of available books and the growth of sound learning was only made possible by the introduction of the printing press to the town of Aberdeen and for this move Bishop Patrick Forbes would appear to have been primarily responsible. He foresaw the great part that such a press must play in the encouragement of all manner of learning. In an age when there were no text books it would save endless dictation and writing necessary for the teaching of subjects

109 Fasti Aberdonenses p 284.
110 Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 87.
111 Rait: op cit p 327: Aberdeen University Review (December 1934 p 26.

like Grammar, Theology, Science and Philosophy. Printing¹¹²
 in Scotland was confined chiefly to Edinburgh, though Edward
 Raban, an Englishman had recently set up a printing press at¹¹³
 St Andrews. It was this Raban who came to Aberdeen, probably
 in the year 1622. Kennedy tells us that in 1621 Bishop
 Forbes and Sir Paul Menzies, Provost of Aberdeen obtained a
 patent from King James VI authorising them to establish a
 printing press in Aberdeen and that shortly afterwards Raban
 was appointed by the magistrates and Town Council, Printer to¹¹⁴
 the town and University. This was the first printing press¹¹⁵
 ever to cross the Grampians.

There is no confirmation of the statement that Forbes and
 the Town Council obtained a patent for printing at Aberdeen
 though it is possible in a venture of this sort that they did so.
 Speaking in July 1630 Andrew Strachan makes the Bishop the
 prime mover in the undertaking and gives us his motive for
 wishing to bring the printing press to Aberdeen: "Our Bishop
 when he perceived the printing press to be a nursery of the¹¹⁶
 library fetched as if from heaven the art of printing.....".
 There is very good reason to conclude that Strachan, who was
 on the spot, is right, though it is obvious that the Bishop

112 Kennedy: Annals of Aberdeen 1 p 174.

113 Strachan: Panegyricus Inauguralis p 37.

114 Kennedy: op cit 1 p 174.

115 Strachan: ib.

116 ib cf Vires Illustres Universitatum Abredonensium
 (Aberdeen 1923) p 151.

could not have moved without the hearty co-operation of the civic fathers. In 1621 Raban had executed some work for Robert Baron, one of the famous Aberdeen Doctors, who had succeeded Patrick Forbes in the living of Keith and for whom the Bishop had the warmest affection and regard. Baron had a close connection with St Andrews University and must have been very well informed about Raban's work. The year after Raban undertook some printing for Baron he appears in Aberdeen and the conclusion that Forbes, at the instance of Baron, took the initiative in bringing Raban north seems irresistible. At Aberdeen Raban printed many famous works including the 'Eubulus' of Bishop Forbes (1627), the 'Irenicum' of Doctor John Forbes (1629), the Book of Canons (1636) and many lesser but extremely valuable works such as Strachan's Panegyricus, and his editions form a real mine of information for the student of Aberdeen and its notable men of those days.

Over King's College the Bishop's influence was supreme. He lived beside the Cathedral which was close to the College and would thus be conversant with all that went on within its walls till the very end and able to intervene the moment the

- 117 Edmond: The Aberdeen Printers p Xll.
- 118 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ 6 p 8, 319.
- 119 Garden & 42: Kennedy: op cit 2 p 119; Fasti Aberdonenses p XXXVII-VIII.
- 120 McMillan: The Aberdeen Doctors p 234-5.
- 121 Edmond: op cit p 25, 29, 200 etc: Kennedy: op cit 1 p 175.
- 122 Henderson: op cit p 36.

necessity arose. As Chancellor he could control all appointments, his suggestion for a vacant office would be readily accepted while he had the right to admit and with it the right to withhold admission to any office. The commission which met under his chairmanship in 1619 appointed to the vacancies which they found and we may take it that the appointments then made were virtually the Chancellor's own. ¹²³ In 1634 Doctor John ~~who had resigned his Chair on his appointment as one of the ministers of St Nicholas, Aberdeen,~~ Forbes [^] was elected Rector in accordance with the terms of the Old Foundation by the Principal, Mediciner, Canonist, sub-Principal, Cantor, Grammararian and three 'procuratores nationum'. According to the minute of the election the Chancellor was not present but the election took place in his house where he was lying ill and his signature to the deed was apparently essential as confirming the choice for it heads the ¹²⁴ list of those who subscribed their act of election. Doctor John Forbes was succeeded in the Chair of Divinity by Andrew Strachan who in the preface to his inaugural thesis makes it clear that the Bishop had the initiative in the appointment, the delegates from the various Presbyteries subsequently ¹²⁵ examining the nominee. Four years later in 1638 when a Royal Commission arrived at King's College, the Principal, Doctor

123 Fasti Aberdonenses p 278: Evidence Taken and Received 4 p 225.

124 Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 9.

125 Aberdeen University Review V. 22 p 19. [^] The Rectorship was really an extra appointment held in conjunction with another post. Upon Strachan's untimely death next year Forbes went back to the Divinity Chair being able to afford to do so because his father's death had now made him Laird of Corse.

William Leslie, the Professor of Medicine, Doctor William Gordon, the Canonist, James Sandilands, the sub-Principal, David Leitch, two regents, Robert Ogilvie and Alexander Gardyn and the Cantor, Gilbert Ross, were called upon to present the credentials of their office. The presentation of each official was found to be under the common seal of the College and the subscriptions of the members, with a certification of his admission to office by the Chancellor.¹²⁶

In Marischal College the authority of the Bishop was necessarily of an entirely different nature. Here where the Earl Marischal was Chancellor and the Town Council the patrons he was forced to rely upon his influence to further the principles which he had at heart and there is ample evidence that this influence became considerable. In the first place it was helped by the fact that all students studying Theology after the completion of the arts course had to study at both King's and Marischal,¹²⁷ while Sibbald who was one of the Bishop's circle of famous divines became a regent in the latter College¹²⁸ in 1619. The Bishop's influence must have greatly increased

126 Fasti Aberdonenses p 289-290.

127 ib p 332: Stephen: The Life and Times of Archbishop Sharp p 2.

128 Kennedy: op cit 2 p 118.

when in the very next year, William Forbes followed Aidy as
 Principal.¹²⁹ This Forbes was related to the Bishop¹³⁰ and was
 amongst the most devout of Aberdeen's outstanding theological
 scholars, holding views considerably in advance of those
 held by the Aberdeen Doctors,¹³¹ William Forbes was preferred
 to the Principalship from the Third Charge of Aberdeen which
 he had held since 1616¹³² and the Bishop's consent to the move
 was sought and readily given.¹³³ Forbes, however, did not
 long retain the Principal's office and was succeeded the
 following year by Doctor Patrick Dun,¹³⁴ already Mediciner in
 King's College¹³⁵ and a man who was closely associated with, and
 greatly influenced by the good Bishop.

With his insistence on sound theological learning Bishop
 Forbes must have wished to see due and adequate attention
 being given to the study of Divinity in Marischal College.
 The Diocesan Synod of April 1619 had spoken of a contribution
 for the support of "two divines"¹³⁶ and it may be that the second
 divine was intended for Marischal. If so the scheme did not

129 Wodrow: op cit p LXIV.

130 ib p LXII.

131 Garden § 41 p 19-20: Gordon: op cit 3 p 241: Burnet:
 Life of Bedell. Preface. McMillan: The Aberdeen Doctors
 p 263-4: Spottiswoode 3 p 268, 269: Calderwood 7
 p 596 f. McMillan wrongly states that Forbes became
 Principal of Marischal in 1618.

132 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 p 14.

133 Anderson: Studies in the History and Development of the
 University of Aberdeen p 41.

134 Rait: op cit p 278.

135 Fasti Aberdonenses p 278.

136 Henderson: op cit p 37.

materialise for in subsequent Presbytery minutes only one
¹³⁷divine is mentioned. But by 1624 sufficient funds were to
 hand for the establishment of a Divinity Chair in the
 College of New Aberdeen. In 1616 Patrick Copland who was
 connected with the East India Company gave 2000 merks to the
 Aberdeen Town Council to be devoted either to bursaries for
 theological students or to the maintenance of a Divinity
 Chair in Marischal College. Towards this latter object
 Copland gave a further 2000 merks in 1622 on condition that
 the patronage rested with the Town Council and about the same
 time David Chamberlain, a friend of Copland mortified 1000
 merks for the benefit of Marischal College. These sums
 together with accumulated interest enabled the civic fathers
 to found a Chair of Divinity in the College of New Aberdeen.
 Garden followed by Wodrow states that Patrick Forbes
 influenced the founding of this second Divinity Chair in his
¹³⁹Cathedral town. So far no direct evidence of this has come
 to light but the Bishop may very well have inspired and
 suggested the move. It was certainly an achievement very
 near to his heart and we know that Copland held him in very
 high regard, for in 1615 he had suggested Forbes for the then

137 ib p 38.

138 Evidence Taken and Received 4 11 p 248: Anderson:
 Records of Marischal College 1 p 159 f, 166 f. In 1627
 Copland bequeathed a further 2000 merks for a Professor
 of Divinity in Marischal College.

139 Garden § 9 p 3: Wodrow: op cit p 97.

vacant Principalship of Marischal and was not a little disappointed when he learned that the latter could not see his way clear to accept the office.¹⁴⁰

To the new Chair the Bishop was able to secure the appointment of Robert Baron whom the previous year he had been instrumental in bringing from Keith. ¹⁴¹ Under a special arrangement, as Professor of Divinity in Marischal College, ¹⁴² Baron also held the living of Greyfriars. Thereafter the Bishop's influence over all theological students at Aberdeen was assured. ¹⁴³ Nor were there lacking in all departments of Marischal College men who, like ¹⁴⁴ Doctor William Johnston, first Professor of Mathematics in 1626, ¹⁴⁵ acknowledged the holy influence of Aberdeen's great Bishop.

Thus Bishop Patrick Forbes gathered around him men of particular light and learning who in turn attracted "a society more learned and accomplished than Scotland had hitherto known which spread a taste for literature and art beyond the academic circle and gave a tone of refinement to the great commercial town and its neighbourhood". ¹⁴⁶ Apart from the celebrated Aberdeen Doctors there congregated about the University men of renown in every walk of life. Doctors Patrick Dun and William Gordon won ¹⁴⁷ a just fame in the sphere of medicine. Robert Gordon of Straloch

- 140 Anderson: Records of Marischal College 1 p 167, 168.
- 141 Garden § 42: Kennedy: op cit 2 p 119: Funerals p LXXVI-VIII: Rait: op cit p 274 Strachan: op cit p 38.
- 142 Garden: ib: Fasti Aberdonenses p XXXVII-VIII: Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 p 8, 319.
- 143 True and Impartial Account of the Most Rev Father-in-God, Dr James Sharp p 28.
- 144 Johnston A. Genealogical Account of the Family of Johnston of that Ilk (Edinburgh 1832) p 38, 39. Rait: op cit p 277.
- 145 Funerals p 365, passim: Vires Illustres Universitatum Abredonensium p 54.
- 146 Fasti Aberdonenses p XL-XLI.
- 147 Strachan: op cit p 37.

father of the well-known historian, John Gordon of Rothiemay, was not ~~only~~^{widely} read in history and literature but was the chief assistant of Scotstarvet in his two great undertakings- the Atlas and the collections of Scots poetry. He was reponsible for the maps of Scotland which he afterwards revised at the special request of Charles I.¹⁴⁹ George Jamieson, the pupil of Rubens, until Raeburn the greatest Scottish painter, was a native of Aberdeen and only the select academic circle of the Bishop could have bound so noble an artist to his own provincial town.¹⁵⁰ Then there was Arthur Johnston, the distinguished Latin poet who contributed to the Bishop's Funerals and David Wedderburn who was master of the Grammar School and Humanist in King's College from 1619, the author of a standard work on the principles of Grammar which Raban printed in 1633.¹⁵¹ During the episcopate of Patrick Forbes this galaxy of intellectuals attracted intelligent and educated foreigners to Aberdeen and inspired a higher class of students than ever before.¹⁵²

When Bishop Forbes came to the See of Aberdeen he found its Colleges the most backward in the Kingdom and he left them without an equal in the land, That at least was the view of one impartial historian from the south and Burnet records that he

148 Author of The History of Scots Affairs.

149 Fasti Aberdonenses p XLII-XLIII.

150 ib p XLIV.

151 Funerals p 18 f: Rait: op cit p 146 f.

152 Rait: op cit p 147: Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 46.

153 Fasti Aberdonenses p XLIV.

154 Clarendon: History of The Rebellion (1826) p 145.

"took such care of the two Colleges in his diocese that they¹⁵⁵ became quickly distinguished from all the rest of Scotland" Not only were the men whom the Bishop attracted to his cathedral town men of outstanding abilities in the sciences and the arts but many of them were generous benefactors. In 1634 Doctor Patrick Dun presented to the magistrates a Deed of Mortmain of his lands of Ferryhill for the benefit of¹⁵⁶ the four masters of the Grammar School. In 1632 Doctor William Johnston gave 1000 ~~marks~~ to the Aberdeen magistrates for the benefit of the poor and he also made gifts of books to¹⁵⁷ the library of Marischal College. Doctor William Guild was¹⁵⁸ also among the noted benefactors. Andrew Strachan in his inaugural address as a regent in King's College in 1630 could proudly boast of the distinguished men who gathered about the University under Bishop Patrick Forbes: "Patrick saw to it that the highest scholastic honours were conferred on men great in every way, whose portraits you see here- men who have brought honour even to the very distinctions themselves. What should I tell of Sandilands, Rait, Baron, Scroggie, Sibbald, Leslie, those very great names! What fame is to be spoken of! Why! So many fathers capped, doctors of theology, law and medicine and bachelors have gone forth from

155 Burnet: Life of Bedell (Preface).

156 Kennedy: op cit 2 p 130.

157 Johnston A: op cit p 39.

158 Rait: op cit p 279: Kennedy: op cit 2 p 239-240.

our places of learning as if in line of battle.....What a great throng of doctors! What brilliance! What greatness in both Johnstons, brothers of the same family and the same art. You have known how powerful their utterances ~~are in mathematics~~ ^{are in mathematics}, in poetry and in the writing of songs. Arthur, physician to the King and inspired poet of elegy and epigram in which he surpasses not only the men of his own age, but equals those of ancient times. William is named with honour teacher of botany and mathematics in which subjects he is most distinguished.....very great is his affability and very great his urbanity".¹⁵⁹

The author of A History of Scots Affairs writing of the state of Aberdeen after the purging of the University by the Covenanters in 1640 paints a very melancholy picture: "Thus the Assembly's work was thoroughly done; these eminent divines of Aberdeen, either dead, deposed or banished in whom fell more learning than was left behind in all Scotland besides at that time. Nor has that city or any city in Scotland ever since seen so many learned divines and scholars at one time together as were immediately before this in

190

Aberdeen. From that time forward learning began to be discountenanced and such as were knowing in antiquity and in the writings of the fathers were had in suspicion as men who smelled of Popery¹⁶⁰".

Under Bishop Patrick Forbes the affairs of King's College continued to be well-ordered and the establishment to flourish. The Old Foundation had prescribed no form of election for the Deans of the various Faculties. This defect was not remedied until July 1634 when at a meeting composed of the Rector and his assessors, the Principal and various Deans and Professors it was unanimously agreed that every Dean of Faculty should be chosen by his own Faculty, and that where voting was equal the Rector should decide.¹⁶¹ Although the Bishop, now in failing health did not take a direct part in the visitation of July 1634, which was under the supervision of Doctor Forbes,¹⁶² it was he who was responsible for its taking place. The visitation resulted in certain appointments being made and the office of Cantor, in abeyance since the Old Foundation fell into disuse, was revived, Gilbert[†]Ross "master of the¹⁶³ music school at Auld Aberdeen" being chosen for the post. In order to bring more dignity to the College the commissioners of visitation decreed that gowns according to the degree and faculties of the students were to be worn in the colleges, schools, churches and streets of the city.¹⁶⁴ There was a

- 160 Gordon: op cit 3 p 242-3: cf Spalding: op cit 1 p.299.
161 Evidence Taken and Received 4 p 182-3.
162 Fasti Aberdonenses p 392-3.
163 ib p 394: Rait: op cit p 139.
164 Fasti Aberdonenses p 394.

further visitation in November of this same year to which reference has already been made, when the Principal and several regents were reprimanded.¹⁶⁵ At one session at which the Bishop was unable to be present it was agreed to refer to him questions regarding the Bachelor's degree and the subsequent teaching of Divinity.¹⁶⁶ At a later session held in the Bishop's palace, on which occasion Forbes was apparently again an absentee, the Rector reported that, with the express approbation of the Chancellor and other members of the College, he had recently sent to King Charles some articles designed to re-establish the Foundation in her ancient jurisdiction and privileges,¹⁶⁷ the outcome of which was that the King authorised the commissioners to peruse the ancient writs and records appertaining to King's College, to call in the King's Advocate for any advice they might need on points of law and with the advice and consent of the Bishop to suppress abuses and settle their affairs as far as they lawfully could.¹⁶⁸ Certain lands, dues and benefits were being withheld and Charles instructed the Lords of Council and Session and the Lord Advocate to see that justice was done.¹⁶⁹ Meanwhile Patrick Forbes wrote to Archbishop Laud of Canterbury, to Doctor Alexander Reid and to Bishop Maxwell of Ross who was

165 ib p 396, 397, 398.

166 ib p 396.

167 ib p 399.

168 ib p 401-402.

169 ib p 403.

present at court to secure their support for the settling of the
 170 College on a satisfactory basis. And since the arrangement
 regarding the rights and privileges appertaining to the
 College was based on that of the University of Paris, the
 authorities there were asked for a copy of their rights and
 171 privileges with a view to clearing up the whole situation.
 Bishop Patrick Forbes, however, did not live long enough to
 see these various matters righted and rebellion shortly
 intervened. Though partially paralysed and grievously ill
 he had remained interested and active in the affairs of King's
 College to the very end.

The policy and administration of the good Bishop and
 Chancellor was severely criticized by the Covenanters and
 172 much of what he had established in the College was subverted.
 In yielding to the Covenanters some of the officials at least
 173 were activated only by fear. The Old Foundation which Forbes
 had restored was swept aside. Doctorates were held up to
 174 scorn and ~~passed into desuetude~~ until after the Restoration of 1660
 175 when they were revived. Under the new **condi**tions the Chair
 of Divinity was to be conferred after competition - the
 patronage was ~~retained~~ **remained** in the hands of the **Synod** though there

170 ib.

171 ib p 400, 403.

172 Gordon: op cit 2 p 155 f: 3 p 343: Spang: Historia
 Motuum p 276: Spalding op cit 1. p 113 f.

173 Spalding: op cit 1 p 95.

174 Peterkin: Records of The Kirk p 239.

175 Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 98.

176

was no mention of a Bishop. Forbes's method of supporting the Professor by means of a clerical levy was, however,

177

maintained. Of the complete justification of the Bishop's administration as Chancellor there can not be the least

doubt, despite the overthrow so shortly after his death, of most of that which he had laboured to establish. Gordon,

178

Burnet, Garden, Irving and even the biassed ultra-Presbyterian

179

180

181

Wodrow offer complete vindications of it, not to mention modern

historians of repute such as Grub, Mathieson and Professor

183

184

G. D. Henderson. In 1633 the Scots Parliament not only

185

ratified all the privileges and possessions of King's College,

but its doctorates and all its faculties - in short it justified the restoration and administration of the Old Foundation by

186

Bishop Forbes. In 1637-38 when Presbyterianism was in the ascendant, following upon mismanagement by Principal William

Leslie, who had digressed from the policy of the late

Chancellor, there was a movement to have the Nova Fundatio

imposed. The policy of Forbes was once again amply justified

- Rait is wrong here in supposing that Bishop Forbes wished to return the patronage for the original donors in so far as these were not the Synod. cf J. Forbes: *Theses Disput. Theol.*
- 176 Rait: op cit p 130.
- 177 Henderson: op cit p 38.
- 178 Gordon: op cit 2 p 155-7: 3 p 243.
- 179 Burnet: Life of Bedell Preface.
- 180 Garden § 11 p 3-4.
- 181 Irving: op cit 2 p 45-8.
- 182 Wodrow: op cit p 97-8.
- 183 Grub 2 p 354.
- 184 Mathieson: op cit 1 p 337.
- 185 Henderson: op cit p 31 f.
- 186 AP 5. p 73: Fasti Aberdonenses p 296: Kennedy: op cit 2. p 375.

for the Royal Commission which visited the College upheld the
187 Old Foundation. Leslie's deviation affords a sure proof of the
Bishop's influence over the affairs of King's College for he
188 was not permitted any digression while Forbes was alive.
And when the Covenanting movement began to gain the upper hand
in the affairs of church and state the Aberdeen Doctors "were
the only persons who could maintain the cause of the church.....
and since that good Bishop died but three years before the
Rebellion broke out, the true force of that advantage they had
189 is justly due to his memory". That the Covenanters regarded
Doctor John Forbes with the greatest admiration is attested by
the number of attempts which they made to win him over to
190 their side and when he was eventually deposed in April 1641
"it was to the great grief of the youth and young students of
191 theology". Andrew Strachan speaking in 1630 named Aberdeen's
three great Bishops as Elphinstone, Dunbar and Forbes, and declared:
"The first founded the College, the second preserved and
enlarged it, the third restored it when it was well-nigh

- 187 Kennedy: op cit 2 p 375-6: Rait op cit p 137.
188 cf supra.
189 Burnet: Life of Bedell: Preface. Gordon: op cit 1 p 82-96:
Spalding: op cit 1 p 59-62: General Demands Concerning the
Late Covenant (Aberdeen 1662). Grub 3 p 14.
190 Spalding: op cit 1. p 216, 224, 232-3, 327: 2 p 39-40, 55.
Baillie: Letters and Journals 1 p 248.
191 Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 69.

195

192
ruined". Bishop Patrick Forbes is justly commemorated in the
Aberdeen University Calendar by the printing of his name in
the roll of Chancellors in a special type otherwise reserved
for the Founder, for assuredly he was its second Founder and
stands in the Apostolic Succession of its history.

192 Strachan: op cit p 7.

The Thought of Bishop Patrick Forbes.

The thought of Patrick Forbes regarding the place of ceremony and ritual in the church has already been examined in the appropriate place. There remains to consider his thought about the church itself. Forbes shared to the full the widespread dread and abhorrence of Romanism which convulsed the minds of his Protestant contemporaries. Nowhere was the strength of the Counter-Reformation more apparent than in Aberdeenshire and in the Preface to his first work Forbes informs us that it was "the empty and arrogant boasting of the Romanists" in the neighbourhood of Corse where pastors were¹ scarce which induced him to enter the field of controversy! His 'Defence of The Lawful Calling of the Ministers of Reformed Churches' was undertaken because of "the insolent and high boasting" of the Papists who denied any lawful calling to the Protestant clergy.² A challenge to this work evoked his 'Letter to A Recusant' and 'A Short Discovery',³ while his last work 'Eubulus' which appeared in 1627 after an interval of

1 A Learned Commentarie. Preface.

2 A Defence of The Lawful Calling etc: Dedicatorie and p 1.

3 Letter to A Recusant p 1: A Short Discovery p 1.

thirteen years was written to combat the influence of a popular Romish rhyme, Forbes complains that people do not understand what they are taught to prattle any more than magpies or parrots and deplores the prevalence of arguments⁴ which bring religion into disrepute and destroy devotion.

The Bishop was a controversialist not for the sake of controversy but for the sake of conviction. His one aim as an author was to present an apologetic for Protestantism but in doing so he presents us with some thoughts on the vexed question of the true church and the Apostolic Succession which are not without their point today.

The dread of Romanism in Scotland throughout the seventeenth century was reflected in the activities of successive General Assemblies, in the Prayer Book agitation of 1637-38, in numerous pulpit utterances and in a steady flow of pamphlets and writings. However diverse the arguments employed the conclusion was always the same, namely that the Pope was the⁵ anti-Christ foretold in the New Testament. This had been the conviction of the three great fathers of Protestantism, Luther, Calvin and Knox, and was strongly held in the French Reformed⁶ Church.

4 Eubulus. Preface.

5 cf Welch J. Popery Anatomised (1672 edition) p 346 f: The Westminster Confession (1645) Chapter 25. Henderson: Religious Life in 17th Century Scotland: passim.

6 Calvin: Institutes BK 2 c. 2 ll. Knox 1 p 189 etc: Quick: Synodicon: 1. p 227, 238, 266.

Patrick Forbes shared this conviction and his writings consist almost entirely of a development and permutation of the common Protestant theme. The burden of his commentary upon the Revelation is that the various excesses of the Papacy plainly show the Pope to be anti-Christ who is to be identified with St John's man of sin.⁷ Rome has traded in gain and is the Receiver amongst the nations because she has deluded the people with her sale of pardons, indulgences, relics, confirmations, and the like.⁸ This accusation is repeated in a subsequent pamphlet where the author speaks of "the forged flame of a pretended purgatory therewith also the doctrine of men's merits",⁹ and declares that Rome by reason of her trade in relics and images has abused the laudable practice of the primitive church in observing the commemoration of martyrs.¹⁰ He does not regard compulsory auricular confession as a truly Catholic practice and appeals to the early Fathers to show that while auricular confession was of ancient use, it was always voluntary until the Roman Church made it obligatory. "Can the Romans" he asks "produce any law imposing private confession before the time of Innocent III?"¹¹ The Roman treatment of conscience he

7 A Learned Commentarie p 131, 134, 169. 176, 247 etc.

8 ib p 180 etc.

9 A Short Discovery p 8.

10 ib p 10.

11 ib p 9.

believes to be wholly malicious and holds the Roman custom of communion in one kind to be a profanation since Our Lord Himself commanded the use of the cup, while Voluntary abstinence in both kinds has led to a degradation in Eucharistic¹³ worship. He is of the opinion that celibacy has been "over far extolled" and he elsewhere concludes that in forbidding marriage to the clergy and in ordering abstinence from meat¹⁴ the Roman Church shows itself to be "a Heretical company". Her claim to be the first publisher of the Gospel and the prime converter of men is disproved by St Paul's missionary work¹⁵ and the New Testament records themselves. The Church of Rome has added her own voice to the voice of the Scriptures: she may have been a truly Catholic church at first but she has¹⁶ become uncatholic. The Papists¹⁷ indeed, have added 'Romanam' to the 'Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam' of the Creed. With special reference to the Roman Church, Forbes points out that "it is one thing to rehearse the common Creed and another thing to hold the points thereof; yea, and one thing to hold them

12 A Learned Commentarie p 69.

13 A Short Discovery p 11.

14 ib: Eubulus p 112-4.

15 Eubulus p 49.

16 ib p 27, 53, 55.

17 A Short Discovery p 4-5.

200
falsely and another thing to hold them truly. One may in
word and profession hold Jesus to have come in the flesh
and yet in effect deny it and so be an anti-Christ".¹⁸
¹⁹

The Pope then, is a traitor of Christ's Kingdom, the Roman
clergy are locusts and scorpions, "an army of darkness" and²⁰
Rome is thus "the mystical Babylon of the Apocalypse, the
scriptural, Babel, Sodom and Egypt making men drunk with
superstition."²¹ The Pope is nothing but a wolf in sheep's
²²clothing and the Denouncing Angel of the Revelation who comes
down from heaven is, for Forbes, the type of "the clear light
and powerful ministry of the Gospel now in a near degree both²³
showing clearly and working powerfully anti-Christ, his fall".

Patrick Forbes based his condemnation of Romanism on the
appeal to Holy Scripture, The Romanists have superimposed
their words upon the Word of God and thus it was possible to
prove "by clear Scripture their Pope to be anti-Christ".²⁴

Forbes was one of the revisers of the Scottish Confession of²⁵
1616 which was even more strongly Calvinistic than its

18 Eubulus p 29.

19 A Learned Commentarie p 133: A Defence of The Lawful
Calling p 18.

20 A Learned Commentarie p 67, 75.

21 ib p 130 etc: A Defence of The Lawful Calling p 66:
Eubulus p 53.

22 A Defence of The Lawful Calling p 14, 15.

23 A Learned Commentarie p 180.

24 Letter to A Recusant p 61.

25 BUK p 1132.

predecessor of 1550 and his whole attitude to the Romanist controversy was that of orthodox Calvinism - the standard of belief in Scotland during the seventeenth century and in England until the time of Archbishop Laud. In essence Calvinism was a re-action against the extravagant claims and practices of the Roman Church. It called for a return to the authority of God's written Word and asserted the priority of the Scriptures over ecclesiastical decrees and customs. It thus substituted for the infallibility of the Pope the infallibility of the Bible. In England the Ten Articles which Convocation adopted, and the King accepted, in 1536, made the Bible and the three ancient Creeds the authoritative standard of teaching.²⁷ Amongst the Thirty Nine Articles issued under Queen Elizabeth one asserted the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation requiring of a man nothing that was not read or proved there, while another laid it down that since councils may err and have not always been governed by the spirit and Word of God, things ordained by them are not

26 cf Knox 2. p 98, 100-101, 104-105: Calderwood 7. p 234, 238, 240. Compare the two Scots Confessions with the Swiss Confession of 1536 printed in the Miscellany of the Wodrow Society 1 p 11 f. There is no real divergence of principle or theory.

27 Fisher: History of Christian Doctrine p 310.

necessary for salvation unless they be in accordance with
 the Scriptures.²⁸ The position attained in Scotland was
 identical. The Confession of 1560 declared the Scriptures
 to be sufficient to instruct and make the man of God perfect
 and asserted their priority over the decrees of the church which
 were to be tested by them, for men are liable to error and have
 erred, and conventions repugnant to the Word of God are to
 be repudiated.²⁹ The Confession of 1616 repeated the same
 convictions even more forcibly and Forbes endorsed its doctrines.³⁰

It was his belief that the Word was the weapon whereby God
 would have the victory.³¹ He believed implicitly in the
 Canonical Scriptures holding "no author to have erred aught in
 his writings".³² Christ's own command to us if we would know
 Him and His True Church was to search the Scriptures.³³ It was
 simply the height of arrogance for the Pope to suppress the
 Word of God by refusing to allow laymen to read it in their
 mother tongue,³⁴ for there can be no trial of true Christianity

28 Bicknell: The Thirty-Nine Articles p 336 f: Gibson:
 The Thirty-Nine Articles p 230.

29 Knox 2 p 112-3.

30 Calderwood 7 p 235: "The authority of Holy Scripture is
 Divine for all are of Divine inspiration and God is their
 author. Their authority depends upon God, not upon men.
 All doctrine of the Kirk must be warranted by them and all
 controversies decided by them".

31 A Learned Commentarie p 205.

32 A Short Discovery p 14.

33 Eubulus p 23-4.

34 A Learned Commentarie p 14-15, 82.

neither any other refuge for Christians willing to know the
truth of the Faith but the Divine and Holy Scriptures,
Doctrine, worship, form of service, ceremonies, sacrifices,
sacraments and saints' days must be examined in the light of
the infallible rule of Holy Scripture. Forbes time and time
again stressed his conviction that we can only know the True
Church from the Scriptures, "the only rule whereunto all the
affairs of His House should be levelled".

Forbes viewed this true Church as the New Jerusalem which
had at last come down through the pangs of martyrdom and the
troubles of anti-Christ to give men light and peace. Satan
and his throne shall never again be erected in the church or
anti-Christ sit therein as God. For Forbes a true Church was
one "where the voice of Christ and His voice only is purely
preached and religiously received". In holding this view he
was at one with Calvin, the compilers of the Confessions of
1560 and 1616 and those who drafted The Thirty Nine Articles in
England. The former Confession described the notes of the

35 A Defence of The Lawful Calling p 41.
36 Eubulus p 103.
37 ib p 23, 24, 30-2, 34 etc.
38 Funerals p LV1.
39 A Learned Commentarie p 240 43. cf Gibson: op cit p 493 f.
40 ib p 247.
41 Eubulus p 23.

True Kirk on earth as "the true preaching of the Word of God,
the right administration of the Sacraments and ecclesiastical
discipline rightly administered," while the Anglican Article⁴²
affirmed the visible Church of Christ to be "a congregation
of faithful men in the which the pure Word of God is preached
and the Sacraments duly administered according to Christ's
ordinance".⁴³ Forbes insisted as against Rome that the proper
marks of Christ's True Church are holiness of doctrine and
purity of worship for men must be inwardly sanctified by the
Word and Spirit before they can show forth the good works of
Christ,⁴⁴ though we are not to suppose, he says, that there will
ever be a time when no hypocrite shall be within the church.⁴⁵
He therefore summarily disposes of the Romanist claims that
the Catholicity, Continuity, Unity and Visibility which they
possess are the marks of a true church. The point he wishes
to make is that these qualities are attributes; viewed as marks
they do not distinguish the true from the false. Doubtless
with a view to combating the rugged Romish rhyme which was

42 Knox 2 p 110: For the exact wording of the 1616 Confession
of Calderwood 7 p 241 Calvin had described the marks of
the True Church as (1) The faithful preaching of the pure
Word (2) The right administration of the Sacraments
(3) The exercise of vigilant discipline. cf Hunter:
The Teaching of Calvin p 151.

43 Gibson: op cit p 493 f.

44 Eubulus p 101.

45 A Learned Commentarie p 249.

circulating at this time, Forbes summed up his thoughts on these points in a catchy little verse:

"Catholic cannot be to sense subdued.
 Continuance is but a common case.
 Things visible are oftentimes unviewed.
 What's unity if it be not a grace ?
 Hypocrisy sometimes usurps the place
 Of Holiness if true light not be leader.
 Who flesh for Spirit, who shades forsooth embrace
 The more devote, more doting they'r, and deader.
 Would'st thou stand stay'd gainst all both Doubts and
 Dangers.

46

Follow Christ's voice and flee the voice of strangers".

His arguments are developed thus: Catholicity is not necessarily a mark of truth for the majority of men may err and have erred. The church is properly Catholic in the sense that it is offered to and for all men. Here again Forbes employs language which shows his hearty concurrence with the doctrines of the two Scottish Confessions of Faith: "Absolutely and most properly the Catholic Church is the whole number of whatsoever time or place who have been, are or shall be united into Christ their Head and live in Him by His Spirit whether

here on earth fighting or hence in heaven triumphing.....
 The Church of which the Fathers spoke as Catholic being
 common, pure and holding truth and by the force of those
 things expelling all inbred and accressing evils or heresies
 was not impertinently (though not quite accurately) called
 the Catholic Church. But the Roman Church has forfeited
 all claim to the title 'Catholic'. The Catholic Church
 truly called is "that company of whatsoever time, place or
 nation, which in communion of one and the same Spirit joined to
 their Head, Christ, do make up the fulness of His mystical
 Body".⁴⁷ For Forbes the Protestant Church, simply because she
 was Protestant, was more truly Catholic than Rome herself.

Nor with Forbes, since Satan has been a liar and murderer
 from the beginning, can mere continuity be a mark of Christ's
 True Church. The true continuity is not one of type, form
 or theory, but one of spiritual essence. It is the invisible
 chain of truth handed down from the Apostles which is the
 indispensable criterion of any church which would claim to be

47 ib p 41-5, 49. cf Knox 2 p 108-109, 119: Calderwood
 7 p 241. This was simply the Pauline view of the
 Church as the Body of Christ, of which He is at once the
 Head, Soul and Life. To be with Christ it was essential
 to be a member of this Body. This was the view which had
 been stressed by both Calvin and Luther and it runs
 throughout all Forbes's writings. cf Hunter: op cit
 p 148-9.

a true church of Christ. This the Roman Church does not possess.
 Patrick Forbes's thought regarding the true Apostolic Succession
 will be considered at some length later in this chapter.

Unity for Forbes is no more necessarily a mark of the True
 Church than continuity for devils may be united. The only
 true unity is that of the Spirit with Christ which the Roman
 Church has lost.⁴⁹ Visibility likewise is common to things good
 and bad and so it cannot be taken either as a sign of truth
 possessed, though Forbes held that "Truth is always in the
 visible church, yea and nowhere else". It is not, however,
 always visible therin.⁵⁰ He wishes to stress that "The True
 Church is in some sort ever visible, though not in herself,
 yet in her infallible ensigns, as who seeth the city and court
 seeth in a sort the Temple, for though he may not see it
 distinctly, he is certain it is there"- a favourite allusion
 with him.⁵¹ But in respect of her inward grace and the purpose
 of grace whereon chiefly the truth of the church rests, she is
 invisible.⁵²

We ought to note that Forbes was careful to maintain that
 it was possible to enter the true, invisible church only by way

48 Eubulus p 62.

49 ib p 90, 95.

50 A Defence of The Lawful Calling p 20.

51 A Learned Commentarie p 133. A Defence of The Lawful
 Calling p 11: Letter to A Recusant p 5.

52 Eubulus p 72-4.

of the visible church for truth was within that church and
⁵³
 nowhere else. Sects and individuals then, cannot be the elect
 of Christ apart from allegiance to an accredited visible church.
 Thus Forbes by his doctrine of invisibility neither surrenders
 the position of the Reformed Church to the various **Nonconformist**
 sects of his own time, nor to the modern theorists who would
 move Christ's invisible society of the saved beyond the confines
 of His visible and witnessing community by asserting that good
 men outside the church may be equally the elect of Christ.

While opposing the Romanist fallacy that because the church has
 always been visible in the common ensign of public profession, in
 other words, that truth and true professors have at all times
⁵⁴
 borne sway and been visible in her, Forbes strenuously affirmed
 the true invisible church to have been always and only found
 within the visible church. Had he not done so his arguments
 would have amounted to a condemnation of all forms of
 institutional religion- a view of which he had no **knowledge** and
 with which he would most certainly have had no sympathy. Like
 Calvin he would have cordially subscribed the mediaeval dictum
 "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus". Not that he was narrow or

53 A Learned Commentarie p 132.

54 A Defence of The Lawful Calling p 19.

intolerant- far from it. He realised, as Calvin himself had realised, the truth of Augustine's statement that there might be many outside the visible church who were chosen and called of Christ. Forbes's real position was that of the Westminster Confession, namely that outside the pale of the visible church "there is no ordinary possibility of salvation".

For Forbes the Reformed Churches were not as the Romanists asserted, new-fangled sects but genuine branches of the truly Apostolic Church of Christ and His saints. Within the visible church which Popedom had led astray there had always been a remnant faithful to Christ.⁵⁵ It is axiomatic with Forbes that a visible church may fall from the foundation 'tota communiter' (the whole in common) but never 'universaliter singuli in ea' (universally each one within her). In the church of the Popes there were undoubtedly many who did not receive the character of Christ but at the same time there were always a few who retained it- the single saints and true worshippers who "misliked and mourned for the iniquity". These formed the true invisible church of Christ.⁵⁶

Calvin like Luther had made a distinction between the visible and the invisible church. The ~~former~~ comprised all the elect, the

55 A Learned Commentarie p 50.

56 A Defence of The Lawful Calling p 8, 11-14, 21-22, 40.
Letter to A Recusant p 3 etc A Learned Commentarie
p 134.

latter included the multitude of professed believers who receive the sacraments, the Word of God and the ministry appointed to preach it. He did not deny that the Christian societies which acknowledge the Pope are "churches of Christ". His warfare was with the Papacy which had perverted spiritual truth and Calvin can therefore indignantly deny that he has withdrawn from Christ's Church and his concern is for the unity and the true Reformed Church.⁵⁷ Neither Calvin nor his spiritual successors like Knox despised antiquity or the ancient writers of the unreformed church simply because they formed a part of that church. Rather did they conceive themselves as continuing the thread of truth and weaving it into a purer church. Out of the impure they were bringing at length the pure which had been hidden, invisible, in the mass of dross, as a chemist⁵⁸ might distil from an alloy the pure metal.

The position of Forbes was precisely that of Knox and Calvin. It is through their spiritual affinity with, and descent from the invisible nucleus of the elect within the visible church of all professing believers, that the Reformers can justly claim to have brought the true church "out of Babel wherein she was long

57 Calvin: Institutes BK 4 c 1 10.

58 ib. Preface: cf A. M. Hunter: op cit p 34 f, 147, 151: Knox 4 p 314, 518: 6 p 194, 501.

211

⁵⁹
captive". They have freed themselves only from the evil and contagious part of the Body of Christ, the Papacy, which was weakening the whole, and now at last that Body, "by the medicinal virtue of the Word and Spirit is recovering health and destroying the formerly destroying disease". It is therefore perfectly ridiculous for the Romanists to ask where the Protestant Church was before Luther.⁶⁰ Thus Forbes insists that "the church was ever and in all ages visible; howsoever not always in a like measure of health and spiritual vigour, which is your mens' gross fallacy. Your men are ridiculous in asking incessantly "Where our church was before Luther's ?"Neither have we another church or a new church as your doctors would persuade the simple, but the same church and a renewed church. Neither have we forsaken the unity and communion of the church within which and whereof we still are; but we have forsaken Babel in the church which hath obfirmated herself against all cure. For howsoever the sick body was the church yet the sickness oppugning and wasting the life thereof was never the church; and albeit in it, yet never of it".⁶¹

Patrick Forbes did not share the antipathy of the more extreme Calvinists towards all ancient writings, decrees and customs. The view he took was that "Antiquity...were a great argument for truth if Satan had not been a liar from the beginning".⁶² In

59 A Defence of The Lawful Calling p 37.

60 Eubulus p 66, 155.

61 ib p 82-4 cf An Learned Commentary Ch. XIV

62 A Short Discovery p 13.

the face of the Romanist assertions that the Reformed Church was new-fangled, he was concerned to claim for Protestantism as much antiquity as possible and his works are interspersed with frequent and apt quotations from the early Fathers. It was this concern of the Bishop's which was the cause of his son's largest and most famous work, the 'Instructiones Historico-⁶³Theologicae' - a comprehensive survey of Christian doctrine without its equal in the religious thought of the century. Forbes viewed the early Fathers and saints, hidden for centuries beneath layers of untruth, as the true strata of Christ, as the invisible foundation with Christ Himself of the true church now erected before the eyes of men.⁶⁴

Thus for Patrick Forbes, and orthodox Calvinist, the Reformation was not in any sense or degree a tragedy as Anglo-Catholicism persistently regards it. The efficacy for Christendom of one church in many lands must be obvious to all, but Forbes was not unmindful of this aspect when he wrote in support of a movement which replaced the one church with the many. The place of the Roman Church amongst the nations was to be taken by a federation of national churches agreeing in communion and fellowship, which having been truly reformed were

63 Garden Vita § 23 p 8. Burnet. Life of Bedell. Preface. cf J. Forbes: Irenicum (1629). Preface.

64 cf Eubulus p 44-5. Compare Forbes's view of the Fathers and their writings with that of the Swiss Confession 1536- it is identical. cf Wodrow Miscellany 1 p 12.

indeed the branches of a true Catholic Church. For Patrick Forbes, as for all good Calvinists, the Reformation was a divine event. God's Spirit had a long while stirred men's hearts until at length they made "a visible separation not from the church, as our adversaries vainly prattle but from anti-Christ... the long covered traitor in the church".⁶⁶ The Bishop viewed the Reformation, in the words of Henderson, "as a return of the church to Christianity, a restoration of Christ to His throne".⁶⁷ Influenced by his favourite piece of Scripture, The Revelation of St John, he pictured the significance of the Reformation thus "The sun arising bright in the morning.....soon after it is by degrees so lapped in clouds and mist as it is not seen of men on the earth, till that, some hours before even, breaking out again clearly and dispelling all that overshadowing darkness it lightens anew the earth". It is, he continues, merely foolish to argue that "the sun thus wresting out from under that overveiling cloud were not the true sun which in the morning had shined, but some counterfeit and never before seen comet..... But the sun hath such a sovereign and singular light and heat as though all the dolts in the world would disclaim it, yet will evince it to be always one and the same.....".⁶⁸ Patrick

65* A Defence of The Lawful Calling p 5 of Hunter: op cit p 160.
 66 ib p 11-12, 17: A Learned Commentarie p 133.
 67 Henderson: op cit p 34.
 68 A Short Discovery p 15.

Forbes concurred heartily in the Knoxian view of the kirk as "no new-found kirk.....but....a part of that holy kirk universal, which is grounded upon the doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles having the same antiquity that the Kirk of the Apostles has as concerning doctrine, prayers, administration of sacraments and all other things requisite to a particular kirk". He⁶⁹ thought of the Protestant church as a continuation of the true church of Christ which had never ceased to exist though it had been long obscured and to the Reformed kirk he would have applied with approval Bishop Gore's well-known definition of the church as "an extension of the Incarnation".

Not only did Forbes stress his belief in a continuity of doctrine and spirit within the church, but in common with every other Scottish Protestant he assumed a continuity⁷⁰ with the pre-Reformation Church in respect of holy orders. It was his contention that "in our ordination we are consecrated not to men but to God...and to Christ...whereupon it doth clearly follow that in deserting the minister of my ordination...and so cleaving still to Christ, whose I am, I do not fall away from the prerogative of my calling"⁷¹. Thus he says the Reformed Church

69 A Learned Commentarie p 140. Knox 6 p 492: 2 p 108 f.
70 cf Historical Papers (CUA)- Cooper's paper on 'Superintendents and Bishops in The Church of Scotland: Spratt: Worship and Offices in The Church of Scotland (1882) p 196.
71 Letter To A Recusant p 24-5.

did not hesitate to receive and use priests ordained in the Roman Church before the Reformation.⁷² Not that he held Roman ordination to have been 'unlawful' or 'invalid'. On the contrary he maintained that ordination at the hands of the ordainers of the Roman Church "was nothing prejudicial to the sincere receiver...who had not as yet espied them to be traitors".⁷³ Ordination is a good and proper action of the church and thus "lawful ordination may be taken from a wolf and thief who as yet still retaineth outward place and power of ordination".⁷⁴ The character of those who carry through the form of admission into the ministry of the church does not really matter. The point with Forbes is that the grace of ordination proceeds from Christ, The Head, Himself: "Lawful ordination is a good and proper action of the Church of Christ....through the life and power of the Head, yet remaining in the Body, albeit affected and having divers members even corrupted with the sore (Papacy)".⁷⁵ and so he can maintain in truly Augustinian fashion that "As the minister of the sacraments (having still outward place and power) neither conferreth inward grace for any worthiness in him, neither letteth (hinders) the collation thereof through his unworthiness, so neither doth the unworthiness of

72 Eubulus p 155.

73 ib.

74 ib p 152.

75 ib.

216

the ordainer (having still place and power of ordination) let⁷⁶
(hinder) the effectualness of ordination in him who is ordained".

Forbes had no sympathy with the non-conformist view that any organised body of Christians can ordain and appoint a lawful ministry. There was a heritage to be preserved and a witness to be borne which demanded a continuity and unity in the church. To this necessary unity orders were essential and any man who "without ordinary calling should intend himself to be a pastor, we would no otherways account of him than of a seditious and turbulent spirit, who either fanatically presuming of graces would vainly despise order, or from some infirmities and defects would arrogantly and uncharitably break⁷⁷ the unity of the church". It is a definite point with Forbes that lawful ordination only belongs to the historic church which has the credential of continuity from Christ.⁷⁸ He realised the value of this continuity for unity.

The Bishop however did not regard episcopal ordination as an essential feature of the church. He rejected the doctrine that succession through a line of Bishops constituted the true Apostolic chain and pointed out that there was a true and excellent

76 Letter To A Recusant p 10. Augustine's dictum was that "the unworthiness of the minister hinders not the grace of the sacrament".

77 A Defence of The Lawful Calling p 15.

78 Eubulus p 151.

church in Scotland before Palladius whom he named as the first consecrated and consecrating Bishop. It is therefore to his mind merely impudent "to conclude as if all, both light and life of a true church did hang wholly on that one point of episcopal ordination"⁷⁹. Whether this allusion to the early Scottish Church is correct or not is beside the point. For Patrick Forbes the true Apostolic Succession is one of spirit- it only exists where there is an identity of holiness and doctrine with the Apostles.⁸⁰ This view he stresses over and over again. Like all Calvinists he held that Apostleship was an extraordinary function till the foundation of the church should be laid, but he also held that others "succeeding in the pastoral and ordinary offices of the church and teaching the same doctrine and keeping the foundation laid by them are truly the successors of the Apostles"⁸¹. It was his contention that "the succession of piety is properly to be holden succession for who professeth the same doctrine of faith, he is partner of the same chair, but who embraceth a contrary faith he ought to be accounted an adversary even sitting in the chair and this indeed hath the name but the other hath the substance and truth of succession".⁸²

Thus Forbes was of the opinion that churches agreeing soundly in all the substantial points of faith are branches of the true Catholic Church and may differ in their forms of church

79 A Defence of The Lawful Calling p 6, 7.

80 ib p 4, 7, 46 etc.

81 Eubulus p 62.

82 A Defence of The Lawful Calling p 8.

government. He honestly believed that however commendable
Episcopacy had proved itself there was tradition for another
system in the early church and in support of this belief he
pointed to the witness of Ambrose and Augustine when they
described the church in Egypt. ⁸³

~~his episcopate, his son Doctor John Forbes was ordained in
the early church as a minister, the father presided
over the ordination of his son to work in the ministry. It had
been the custom of the church to ordain by the laying on of
hands.~~

In his 'Irenicum', Doctor John Forbes gives us a detailed
exposition of the views which he shared with his illustrious
father. He maintained that it was taken for granted in the
early church that Bishops were over Presbyters by divine law
and that a disparity of ministers was sanctioned by the New
Testament. At the same time Forbes held that Presbyters had
by divine law the power of ordination just as they had the
power to preach and baptise, though he thought that where there
was a Bishop they would require a special commission to exercise
it. He spoke of the Presbyterate as the fundamental order

~~the church was a Presbyterian church.~~

which sent forth the others from itself, He concluded that some offices pertain to Presbyters individually, some collectively, the latter being exercised by a Bishop or Presbytery. Preaching, baptising, celebrating the Eucharist, reconciling penitents, he cited as amongst the former, where each Presbyter has plenary power including both aptitude and execution. To the latter belong Confirmation, Ordination, deposition and examination where the individual Presbyter has aptitude but the power of execution is lodged in the Bishop or Presbytery. In Apostolic times it seemed good to the Holy Spirit for the taking away of differences to give the power of public jurisdiction to one of the Presbyteral college and so the Episcopate arose. Doctor John Forbes summarised his studies thus: "The Canonists say that ordination belongs to the Episcopal order. We say it belongs to the Presbyteral order, but that so far as power of plenary execution goes it belongs to the Episcopal order". The Episcopate is a distinct order and a church which does not possess it labours under a certain economic defect though it does not on that account cease to be a true church.

The Bishop and his son held very strongly that Episcopacy was not of the 'esse' but was rather of the 'melius esse' of the church. Patrick Forbes regarded the chain of Truth as the essential in a church and not a mere lineal succession through a chain of

85 J. Forbes: Irenicum 2. p 409 f: Historical Papers (CUA)
p 146 f of Garden: Book 2 p 529-619.

Bishops. He recognised, however, that the latter had often bestowed "the gift of Truth" and stressed his preference for Episcopacy as a system of unity and order not inconsistent with the evidence of Scripture.⁸⁶ It was this conviction which allowed him to accept ordination and consecration at the hands of Bishops who had so recently received the formal Apostolic Succession from the Anglican prelates. Neither Patrick nor John Forbes considered that differences of church order, any more than questions of ritual⁸⁷ were momentous enough to break the peace of the church.

Such views did not find favour with Archbishop Laud and his High Church school, nor did they appeal to extremists on the other side like Gillespie, Rutherford and Row⁸⁸ who regarded the prelate as a type of anti-Christ. The views held by the two Forbes were, however, the generally accepted standard in both England and Scotland throughout the years 1560-1638. The question of the Apostolic Succession was not a subject of general controversy- that arose later. For the most part the Reformers were occupied with questions as to orthodoxy and as

86 A Defence of The Lawful Calling p 5-8: Funerals lvi.
 87 cf Garden p 16.
 88 cf Row: p 260 etc: Gillespie: English-Popish Ceremonies:
 Rutherford: The Due Right of Presbytery.

to the scope and nature of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

While Calvin had no serious objection to Bishops as long⁸⁹ as they proved themselves serviceable and Knox was similarly minded the early Reformers did not regard Episcopacy as essential to a true church. The Latin version of the Scots Confession of 1560 stated explicitly that ~~there was~~⁹⁰ a perpetual succession of Bishops was in no way necessary. A succession through Presbyters was not questioned and it was fully⁹¹ realised by Calvin and others that such a succession continued and expressed in an ordination ceremony was of value in preserving the heritage of the church. Their immediate re-action was against a prelacy which had proved itself increasingly corrupt. Ordination in Scotland prior to 1610 was by the laying on of the hands of the local ministry with⁹² fasting and prayer. After the Anglican consecrations of that year the Bishops made no attempt to impose episcopal⁹³ ordination and the presbyteral form remained in common use.

89 Pannier: Calvin et l'Episcopat (1926).

90 Historical Papers (CUA) p 24.

91 Institutes BK 4 c 3 16: c. 19 28.

92 BUK p 496, 905, 925: Knox 2 p 245-7: Scot: Apologetical Narration p 25: Calderwood 3 p 205-7 5 p 584-6, 597-9: Baird: Annals of a Tweeddale Parish p 233.

93 cf Appendix XLV

During the Episcopal period Gillespie was admitted to the charge of Kirkcaldy by the laying on of the hands of the⁹⁴ Presbytery and the service was that of the Psalm Book, and a fortnight previously the Presbytery of Haddington had ordained Robert Ker to be "conjunct minster with his father"⁹⁵ at Prestonpans. In November 1616 William Forbes of Monymusk, the future Bishop of Edinburgh was admitted to one of the town charges of Aberdeen by the laying on of the hands⁹⁶ of three ministers. Row tells us that at the ordination of his nephew, William Row, to the living of Forgandenny in 1624, the Bishop of Dunblane professed that he came there not as a Bishop but as a member of the Presbytery and that he would ask nothing that was not contained in the Psalm⁹⁷ Books. Bishop Cowper of Galloway is said to have ordained⁹⁸ a man in his own bedroom, while in 1626 we read of ministers being admitted to their office without any semblance of⁹⁹ episcopal ordination, and the following year Samuel Rutherford was ordained according to the Presbyterian form to the parish

94 Presbyterie Book of. Kirkcaldie p 130.

95 Diary of Lord Wariston. p 338.

96 Selections from The Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen p 85.

97 Row p 326-7.

98 Calderwood 7 p 350.

99 Select Biographies (Wodrow Society) p 136.

of Anworth.¹⁰⁰ The general view of the Apostolic Succession in Scotland was expressed by Rutherford and Menzies in words very similar to those used by Bishop Patrick and Doctor John Forbes. Rutherford wrote: "We maintain only a succession to the true and Apostolic doctrine"¹⁰¹, while Menzies declared that "succession merely personal and local, if it be not also doctrinal,¹⁰² cannot prove a true church".

Similar views prevailed in the Church of England. Archbishop Cranmer distinctly asserted the parity of Bishops and Presbyters and maintained that Bishops require no special consecration. To unchurch the various Protestant sects was so far from his thoughts that he urged upon Calvin that harmony of doctrine would tend to unite the churches of Christ.¹⁰³ The 23rd of the Thirty Nine Articles of Religion which dealt with the subject of ordination and ecclesiastical succession appears to have been framed in such a way as to avoid raising the question of episcopal ordination, Article 36 while affirming the validity of orders conferred by the laying on of the hands of Anglican Bishops studiously avoids calling in question the

100 Historical Papers (CUA) p 139.
101 Rutherford: The Due Right of Presbyteries p 189, 230
102 Menzies: Roma Mendax p 375, 380.
103 Fisher p 315.

validity of non-episcopal ordination.¹⁰⁴ The Preface to the Anglican Ordinal, the purpose of which was to state clearly the law of the Church of England on this subject maintained that there were three orders in the church, Bishop, Priest and Deacon, but it did not claim that these orders were to be everywhere found in the primitive church; nor did it state that they were essential to a church. It simply stated that no man was to fulfil any office unless called by "lawful authority" - a phrase neither expanded nor explained. The three historic orders were to be continued and used, but nothing was said regarding their validity or otherwise and no aspersions were cast on non-episcopal orders.¹⁰⁵ Ministers having no other than Presbyterian ordination and coming to England were licenced to livings on the strength of it. Archbishop Grindal of Canterbury in licencing a Presbyterian divine spoke of him as "called to the ministry by the imposition of hands according to the laudable form and rite of the Reformed Church of Scotland".¹⁰⁶ Hooker, who wrote his monumental 'Ecclesiastical Polity' towards the close of Elizabeth's reign, recognised the

104 Gibson: op cit p 573 f, 729 f: Bicknell: op cit p 406 f.

105 Historical Papers (CUA) p 30 f.

106 Strype: Life of Archbishop Grindal 6 c 13.

validity of ordination as practised in the foreign Protestant churches, though he did not consider that it conformed to the Apostolic model and it was his opinion that "there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a Bishop"¹⁰⁷. Bishop Andrewes of Ely and Winchester, the leading High Churchman of his day, wrote to Du Moulin of the French Reformed Church- a non-episcopalian body- that "It is not to condemn your church to call it back to another form (of polity) which is more agreeable to all antiquity". This, in reply to Du Moulin's assertion that 'iure divino' claims condemn other churches.¹⁰⁸ The Anglican Canons of 1604 had obviously no intention of unchurching the Presbyterian bodies, for they required prayer for the sister church of Scotland at that time Presbyterian and lacking the traditional Apostolic Succession through the laying on of episcopal hands.

With Patrick Forbes as with all good Calvinists the authority of the Bible was supreme. His early training under Andrew Melville had made him a close student of Holy Scripture and Sibbald tells us that even to hear him reading the Bible was more illuminating than a study of commentaries.¹⁰⁹ In his

107 The Ecclesiastical Polity (Keble's edition) 7. 14. 11.

108 ~~Opuscula~~ Posthuma Lanceloti Andrewes (Oxonii 1852) p 189-192.

109 Funerals p 163.

22p

exposition he did not consider himself bound to the mere letter of his Genevan or Greek text but like the earliest Reformers sought in the guidance of the Spirit to present an intelligent interpretation. Thus he took great pains over his preaching and ventured upon his commentary of the Book of Revelation.

Although Forbes applied so much of his meditation upon this book to the condemnation of the Papacy as anti-Christ in the spirit of the age and according to his lights, this must not blind us to his real scholarship nor to his strong mystical trait. He treats the Apocalypse chapter by chapter in a manner which, if it adapts St John's thought to the conditions of a later age, at least preserves the mystical spirit of the seer's recorded visions. There is in the commentator a deep reverence for the revelation of the Spirit and he speaks of "the mystery of godliness and also of iniquity" and says that "to know the hid secrets of either none ever shall attain who by the heavenly light of the Word goeth not higher than all authority, multitude, custom and consent of men", ¹¹⁰ He finds opportunity to speak of the true inward calling which alone for him justifies the setting apart of a man for the work of the ministry

and sacraments. It is his conviction that the true minister of Christ must have "a heart to pray for light" and ability to devote himself to "a diligent and careful study of scripture" in which he will discover "a sweet delight and taste.....of spiritual joy". And there is yet one other essential- zeal to preach God's Word "though the preaching thereof beget them of the world great trouble and many tears". Forbes concludes his commentary in a truly mystical vein: "So then after the things here revealed and performed we have but to attend His coming, which is confirmed by the inward testimony of the Spirit; stirring up this desire both in the Bride (the whole Body of the True Church) and particularly in every member hearing truly".

Patrick Forbes was a great administrator and an able apologist but he was first and foremost, though not so prominently, a mystic and a saint, as Garden has testified. The biographer has informed us that the Bishop's sermons were not inflated with an idle pomp of words, nor filled with philosophical reasons, nor embellished with theatrical gestures, because imbued himself with a feeling of divine things, he desired, heart speaking to heart, to impress the same upon others and to expound the mysteries

111 ib p 87.
 112 ib p 355.

of God, not in words of human prudence but in those taught by
 the Holy Spirit.¹¹³ One of his favourite texts was "Come unto Me¹¹⁴
 all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest".
 He longed to bring nearer that vision in the Book of Revelation
 upon which he loved to dwell- the New Jerusalem descending from
 above with peace and blessing for all mankind.¹¹⁵

Within the limits imposed by his time Forbes shows a clear
 grasp of Old and New Testament exegesis and can appeal with
 force to the thought of the early Fathers upon the various texts
 of the Bible. He writes in good straightforward English with
 a weakness for alliteration and a gift of homely and telling
 illustration. His works abound in culture, in perspicuity,
 Christian courtesy and real honest good humour. His treatment
 is vigorous and his language is often strong, but there is no
 vulgarity or cheapness or bitterness such as coloured so many
 writings in this century of acute religious cleavage and dispute.
 For instance he can appeal to his opponents, as in Eubulus,
 with a sweet reasonableness: "Let us lay aside what either you
 of yourselves or we of ourselves do partially speak....and let
 us try what is true of both".¹¹⁶ Again he concludes his letter to

113 Garden § 15 p 6.

114 Funerals p 163.

115 A Learned Commentarie p 247.

116 Eubulus p 48 cf p 158.

A Recusant who has disappointed him by saying that he will not weary of trying to guide and help him "according to my power in Christ....God, even the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ according to His good pleasures and abundantly rich grace, grant us that our love may move and more abound in knowledge and all spiritual sense, whereby we may be able to discern things that differ and proving all to hold that which is good¹¹⁷ that we may be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ". Patrick Forbes stands revealed in his writings as a real mystic and yet at the same time as a churchman with an intensely practical mind. Perhaps like so many of the saints he may best be described as a practical mystic, for he had that direct apprehension of God which is the very essence of mysticism and the courage and ability to apply it to the daily affairs and problems of life which is the characteristic of all builders of Christ's Kingdom

117 To A Recusant p 30.

Chapter X.

The Influence of Bishop Patrick Forbes and His Circle.

Shortly after the Bishop's death a memorial volume was published at Aberdeen under the supervision of Doctor John Forbes. The title page of this invaluable production is sufficient to indicate the nature and depth of Patrick Forbes's influence.¹ The compilation included amongst other tributes sermons by all the Aberdeen Doctors, a funeral oration by David Leitch, sub-Principal of King's College, verses by Sir Robert Gordon of Straloch, Arthur Johnston, David Wedderburn, Patrick Painter, George Wishart and Arthur Ramsay and a Greek tetrastich² by Robert Downie, Librarian of King's College. Not all the contributors belonged to the Bishop's own select circle and some who paid their homage were afterwards to be found on the side of the Covenanters.² The Bishop's influence was

- 1 The full title of the volume which included a portrait was: "Funerals of a Right Reverend Father-in-God, Patrick Forbes of Corse, Bishop of Aberdeen. *Τὸ ἐν Ἀγίας* Reverendissimi in Christo Patris, Patricii Forbesii a Corse, Episcopi Abredonensis Tumulus, a multis omnium ordinum collachrymantibus variegato opere exornatus".
- 2 David Leitch was amongst those who went over to the Covenanters. Ramsay, sub-Dean of Edinburgh and a Professor in that University, according to Gordon, strongly opposed the use of the 1637 Prayer Book and accepted the Covenanting position. David Lindsay, another contributor to the Funerals, Rector of Aberdeen University from 1645-1650 also signed the Covenant and became a zealous Covenanter. William Guild another contributor was one of the first in Aberdeen to sign the famous "Band". cf Kennedy: op cit 2, p 403, 405: Spalding. n cit 1 p 229: Gordon: op cit 1 p 43-4. McMillan: The Aberdeen Doctors p 261-3: Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6. passim.

that of the saint which penetrates the barriers of class and creed and continues down the generations to inspire worship, culture and good works in all upon whom it should happen to alight.

Just as the saintly and scholarly Elphinstone had attracted³ to Aberdeen men like Hector and Arthur Boece and William Hay, so did Forbes attract about his person brilliant scholars and many⁴ notable men, the most famous of whom were the Aberdeen Doctors. These were the only men in Scotland who by sheer force of intellect and sure grasp of principle were capable of withstanding and⁵ confounding in open debate the leaders of the Covenanters. Burnet quite rightly maintained that the advantage which the Aberdeen Doctors had over the Covenanting party was due to the⁶ personality and influence of their late beloved Bishop. It was chiefly through his son, Doctor John Forbes and the little group of Aberdeen Doctors that the Bishop's influence descended upon successive generations. Their piety and learning, which he had inspired, established Episcopacy and the views which they

3 First Report of The Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts (1874) p 200.

4 cf Chapter VIII.

5 McMillan: The Aberdeen Doctors p 269-270.

6 Burnet: Life of Bedell. Preface. cf The House of Forbes p 316

so brilliantly defended, in the minds and hearts of the people. This is the real reason why the Covenanters had little support in and around Aberdeen even after they had succeeded in dispersing the Doctors and had secured the signature of many of their adherents to the Covenant.⁷ Their submission was very much a matter of form. Outward conformity in itself meant very little and the spirit of Bishop Forbes and the Aberdeen Doctors survived in those whose hands were forced by circumstances, to shine with renewed lustre throughout and beyond the turbulent times of the second Episcopate and the second Revolution of 1688.

Years of Covenanting supremacy enforced with threats, deprivations, and at the point of the sword could not eradicate a preference for the episcopal viewpoint and form of church government on the part of the people of Aberdeen who, more than any other section of the community, welcomed the restoration of monarchy

7 When Doctor John Forbes was deposed in April 1641 "it was to the great grief of the youth and young students of theology". cf Anderson: Officers and Graduates p 69 (Quotation) Sibbald was held in the highest regard even by his enemies cf Gordon: op cit 3 p 230 Baron and Ross were "well-beloved of their flocks and people while they were in life and after they are dead heavily regretted." cf Spalding: op cit 1 p 226 For evidence of the general attitude which continued amongst the clergy of Aberdeen. cf Consultations of The Ministers of Edinburgh (SHS 1921 and 1930) 1 p 38.

An additional reason for the failure of the Covenanting party to impress their principles upon the people of Aberdeen ^{is to} ~~must~~ be found in the influence and opinions of the great and respected Huntly family which was Catholic and loyal.

and Episcopacy in 1660 and 1661. With Episcopacy there went the high assertion of royal authority and influenced as it had been by Bishop Patrick Forbes and his followers, Aberdeen continued to be not only a centre of distinctive theology and art, but a stronghold of loyalty to the Stewart regime and to the rule of Bishops in the church- the home of high cavalier politics and anti-Puritan sentiments in religion and ecclesiastical government. Throughout the eighteenth century, Episcopacy, stamped almost out of existence by the pressure of the Penal Laws, found its chief source of strength amongst the peasantry⁸ and people of Aberdeen. In that dark century when the life of the Episcopal Church was crushed and broken, many of her greatest leaders came from Aberdeen or were alumni of its University. As a matter of historical interest it was in a small Episcopalian meeting house in Aberdeen that the first Bishop of the Episcopal Church in America- Samuel⁹ Seabury of Connecticut- was consecrated in 1784, while as late

- 8 To list only a few outstanding names: Dr George Garden, Bishops Alexander, Robert Keith, William Dunbar, Robert Kilgour, Alexander Jolly, John and William Skinner, father and son. cf Farquhar: Three Bishops of Dunkeld (Perth 1915): Keith: Catalogue of Scottish Bishops. Walker: Memoirs of Bishops Jolly and Gleig (Edinburgh 1878): Grub Vol^s: 3 and 4.
- 9 Seabury first sought consecration at the hands of the English Bishops. Everyone was annoyed over the loss of the American colonies and the Bishops of the Established Church of England refused consecration. Seabury at length approached the Bishops of the disestablished Episcopal Church in Scotland, who agreed to confer the Apostolic gift. Thus the Scottish^{Episcopal} Church did for America what the English Church, owing to political circumstances could not do. It was surely fitting that this historic incident should take place in Aberdeen. cf Farquhar: ib ii p 53-7: Lawson: History of The Scottish Episcopal Church since the Revolution (Edinburgh 1843) p 326-8.

as 1830-1838 all the six Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church belonged to the North-East or Aberdeen district.¹⁰ To this very day that corner of Scotland is reckoned to be the citadel and home of Episcopacy beyond the Tweed.

The vision of the saints is handed down to the future first by the influence that they have exercised over the minds and aspirations of their contemporaries, and secondly, by way of their written words. A second and a third generation receive their spirit and learn of them until at length their contribution to belief and culture merges into the ever-widening stream of experience and cannot be so readily discerned. The legacy of Bishop Patrick Forbes and the Doctors of Aberdeen was of just such a kind. The divinity students of the Aberdeen Colleges had been for the most part in sympathy with their spiritual leaders and teachers in opposition active or passive to the Covenant¹¹ and upwards of forty men who had studied at King's College in the time of Patrick Forbes and the Aberdeen Doctors held livings, the majority of them in the North-East during the Restoration period.¹²

10 Walker: *Memoirs of Jolly and Gleig* p 1. The number of Bishops in the Scottish Episcopal Church was subsequently raised to seven, when in 1846 Bishop Low provided an endowment for a seventh Bishopric- that of Argyll and the Isles. *cf ib* p 367.

11 Gordon: *op cit* 3 p 220. *cf* Spalding: *op cit* 1 p 132.

12 *cf* *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae* (1926) 6 *passim*: Anderson: *Officers and Graduates of King's College* p 182-7.

In an age when sons frequently followed in their fathers' footsteps there were several instances of the sons and even of the grandsons, of men who had been prominent in the Diocese or Colleges of Aberdeen during the episcopate of Patrick Forbes holding livings in their native district in the latter half of the seventeenth century. Amongst such were Alexander Ross of Monymusk and his brother Arthur of Old Deer, who became Bishop of Argyll in 1675 and was successively translated to Galloway, Glasgow and St Andrews, whose father John Ross of Birse had eventually submitted to the Covenanters "with tears in his eyes"¹³, William Scroggie parson at Rathven, who became Bishop of Argyll in 1666 and Alexander his brother incumbent of Old Machar from ¹⁴ 1659, whose father had opposed the Covenant and defied the Assembly. In addition Bishop William Scroggie had himself studied under ¹⁵ Doctors John Forbes and Robert Baron. There was also James Garden, Professor of Theology in King's College, where he graduated in 1662, whose father Alexander Garden had been minister at Forgue under Bishop Forbes, and his famous brother Doctor ¹⁶ George Garden who succeeded to his father's living in 1677.

- 13 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ 6 p 82: Lawson: op cit p 580. Appendix.
- 14 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ 6 p 18, 295: Keith: Catalogue of Scottish Bishops p 291.
- 15 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ ib p 295: Henderson: op cit p 42.
- 16 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ ib p 2. 20, 254. Fasti Aberdonenses p 478, 521. cf Turiff Presbytery Register MSS.

The Garden brothers more perhaps than any others were instrumental in carrying the spirit of the Aberdeen Doctors and Bishop Forbes into the eighteenth century¹⁷. Here mention must also be made of the Gardens' like-minded relatives Alexander and George Middleton, father and son, and of a kindred branch of the Strachan family who zealously continued the ideals current at Aberdeen during the enlightened episcopate of Patrick Forbes. Andrew Strachan who left Logie-Durno in 1634 to occupy the Divinity Chair at King's College was succeeded by his brother Alexander, a close friend and fellow-martyr of Doctor John Forbes, who survived into the Restoration period. This Alexander married a Katherine Strachan daughter of the minister of Kincardine O'Neil, granduncle of Alexander Strachan of Thornton and brother of William Strachan, Laird of Tillyfroskie. Bishop Patrick Forbes's mother was a Strachan of Thornton and through her he was related to other well-known branches of the Strachan family such as the La¹⁸irds of Tippetie. To this same circle belonged John, first Earl Middleton, grandson of Alexander Strachan of Thornton, a most distinguished royalist and a staunch Episcopalian¹⁹. Another illustrious grandson was Alexander Middleton who had studied

17 cf later.

18 cf Chapter 1.

19 Aberdeen University Review 22 p 20-21 cf Rait: The Making of Scotland p 241, 251 f.

divinity at King's College in the early 1630's and had fled before the Covenanters. He became Principal of his old College in 1663, holding that office for twenty-one years. He was entirely of a mind with Forbes and the Aberdeen Doctors under whom he had sat and as Principal exerted a deep and lasting influence upon several generations of students and caused the affairs of the College to flourish. He was succeeded by his son George, cousin to the Gardens, who inherited not only his father's office but also his views and remained Principal of King's College until 1717.²⁰ Yet another member of this family who helped to maintain the standpoint of the Aberdeen Doctors was John Strachan, nephew of Professor Andrew Strachan, regent in King's College in the early 1660's, a thorough royalist and Episcopalian, whom Orem²¹ described as "the best scholar that ever was in the College".

Besides William Scroggie and Alexander Middleton, others who had sat under Forbes and Baron achieved prominence in the Second Episcopate. Amongst these were John Patterson, Bishop of Ross, Patrick Forbes, Bishop of Caithness, William Rait, George Haliburton, Bishop of Dunkeld, James Sharpe who became Archbishop of St Andrews and William Douglas, Professor of

20 Aberdeen University Review 20-21 p 213-6.

21 ib 22 p 20-1. John Strachan became Rector of The Scots College at Rome and died in that office in 1671.

Divinity in King's College from 1643-1666. Sharpe had been particularly influenced by Forbes and Baron and it was said of him that "under those great tutors in that sacred science his advances were extraordinary; and there he ²³sucked in a set of such orthodox and Catholic principles as were more agreeable to his after elevated character and the last scenes of his life than adapted to these tragical times". He was one of those expelled from King's College for refusing the Covenant and later he was described as ²⁴"a man entirely Episcopalian in principle".

As successor in the chair of Doctor John Forbes under whom ²⁵he himself must have studied theology from 1620-1623, during the twenty three years of his Professorship William Douglas would pass on to several generations of students the essentials of his great predecessor's teaching. As one who had served for many years as a parish minister under Patrick Forbes he could speak at first hand of the life and ideals of that saintly prelate. Amongst those who had studied under him were Robert Douglas who ²⁶became Bishop of Brechin in 1682 and James Garden, Professor of

22 Henderson: op cit p 42.

23 True and Impartial Account of The Most Reverend Father-in-God, Doctor James Sharpe p 28.

24 Consultations of The Ministers of Edinburgh 2 p Vll f: XXXIX. cf Keith: op cit p 41 Stephen: The Life and Times of James Sharpe p 2-4 etc.

25 Scottish Notes and Queries V: Xl-Xll 3rd series May 1934.

26 Keith. op cit p 168. Anderson: Officers and Graduates p. 182, 190.

Divinity in King's College from 1681-1697, whose influence²⁸ in the north continued long after he was deposed. It is almost certain that George Garden and Henry Scougal, between whom there²⁹ existed the closest friendship, also studied divinity at Aberdeen and though not under Douglas, as students in Arts during his³⁰ tenure in office, and already deeply interested in theology they would be familiar with his expositions. Scougal became Professor of Divinity in King's College at an early age, but a life full of intellectual and spiritual promise was cut short by his untimely death in 1678, and in 1683 incumbent of the town parish of St Nicholas where he exerted a great influence for many years.³¹

These men were all in a position to influence the minds of successive generations of Aberdeen students and it was through them that the spirit and teaching of Bishop Forbes and his celebrated circle of divines continued and passed into the eighteenth century. The Aberdeen Doctors had stood and fallen for Episcopacy and for loyalty to the person of the lawful reigning monarch.³² The continuance of their influence is to be seen in the refusal of the vast majority of the clergy and people of the North-East to recognise the political and religious settlement of 1688-89 which carried to their logical and legal conclusion the principles

27 Anderson: ib: p 70: Henderson: Mystics of the North-East p 61.

28 Henderson: ib p 13, 61 f.

29 ib p 32-3: Fasti Aberdonenses p 478, 521: Records of The Exercise of Alford p 68.

30 Anderson: op cit p 200, 203. George Garden graduated in 1666, Henry Scougal in 1668.

31 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 p 19, 63. McMillan: The Aberdeen Doctors p 265.

32 Grub 3 p 14.

expressed in the National Covenant of 1638. Conscience would not allow them to acknowledge William and Mary as lawful sovereigns and conviction prevented them from accepting Presbyterianism now by law established. In the district of Aberdeen more often than not Jacobitism and Episcopalianism were synonymous terms, as in the case of George Middleton and George Garden who were so thoroughly Episcopalian and so sincerely Jacobite.³⁴ Amongst those who were deprived for their refusal to accept the settlement of 1688-89 were James and George Garden³⁵ and John Dunlop minister at Skene whose mother was a daughter of Professor William Douglas,³⁶ Andrew Burnett who had contributed towards the new building at King's College,³⁷ and James Gordon incumbent of Foveran, a grandson of Doctor William Gordon the close associate of Bishop Patrick Forbes.³⁸ The thirteen Scottish Bishops of the Revolution period³⁹ felt unable to give full and unconditional recognition to William and Mary and found themselves the leaders of a disestablished and disendowed sectarian church. Four of these had been educated at King's College Aberdeen, under the successors of John Forbes and Andrew Strachan. They were Arthur Ross, now Archbishop of St Andrews and Robert Douglas

- 33 Henderson: *ib* p 14 f: Grub 3 p 315-71. Garden: *The Case of The Episcopal Clergy* p 14-15 *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae* 6 *passim*.
- 34 Henderson *ib* p 21 f: *Aberdeen University Review* 22 p 20.
- 35 Henderson *ib* p 21, 61: Anderson: *Officers and Graduates* p 70.
- 36 *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae* 6 p 74.
- 37 *ib* p 38.
- 38 *ib* p 194.
- 39 There were 14 Scottish Sees in all but Doctor Monro, Bishop-Elect of Argyll in 1688 does not appear to have been consecrated.

Bishop of Brechin and Dunblane, Alexander Rose Bishop of Edinburgh and William Hay Bishop of Moray. Without exception they were saintly and scholarly men of the highest rank who truly stood in the Apostolic Succession of the Aberdeen Doctors⁴¹ whose influence was carried into the second and third generation of disestablished Episcopalians by Robert Keith, Bishop of Caithness, Orkney and the Isles. Keith had studied at Marischal College early in the eighteenth century where he was closely associated with and very much influenced by Doctor George Garden. At this very time Garden was engaged upon a new edition of Doctor John Forbes's works and it was Keith who translated for him the last seven years of the Doctor's Diary. When the 'Usages' controversy convulsed the Episcopal remnant, like the Aberdeen Doctors, Keith was not disposed to disturb the peace of the church by the introduction of practices which however justifiable on grounds of antiquity and tradition

40 cf supra.

41 Lawson: op cit p 30-31, 32. 33. A Latin Epitaph upon the tomb of Bishop William Hay in the old churchyard of Inverness describes him as "a prelate of primitive holiness and great eloquence, at all times a constant maintainer of the church and regal dignity, as well in their afflicted as in their flourishing condition. He adorned the Episcopal mitre by his piety and honoured the same by the integrity of his life and affable behaviour.....a most blessed end followed his upright life".

242

42

were new and disquieting to the mass of people.

It can justly be claimed that the Aberdeen divines who flourished under Bishop Patrick Forbes founded a school which kept Scottish Theology as expressed in the Westminster Confession of 1645 from becoming a mere set of formal rules and tenets. They breathed into the future a liberal spirit and stimulated religious enquiry.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor writing in 1659 to a fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, about the choice of books for the beginning of a theological library named two treatises of Baron's especially and recommended generally "everything of his".

43

Henry Scougal the brilliant young Professor of Divinity in King's College who died in 1678 was thoroughly caught up in the spirit and teaching of the Aberdeen Doctors and in his turn greatly influenced George Garden and the two famous evangelical preachers of the next century, Wesley and

44

Whitefield. Like the Doctors he contrasted the union of the soul with God with that spirit which produced so much bitterness and strife and with externalism and mere enthusiasm, which he maintained, had been in all ages the shadow and false imitation of true religion.

45

Professor James Garden's ~~present~~ work 'Comparative Theology' was written in the same spirit. The author sought to give proportion

42 Keith: op cit p XLX f: cf Appendix XV.

43 Irish Ecclesiastical Journal. March 1849.

44 Henderson: ib p 13.

45 Scougal: Works (Glasgow 1765) p 9, 48, 64 f etc.

242

to the religious outlook of his day just as the Aberdeen Doctors had sought to give it in their day, and like Bishop Patrick Forbes he distinguished carefully between the essence of true Christianity which is to be found in the love of God and the means of conveying it- doctrine, government, worship and discipline wherein men differ. Like Doctor John Forbes both Scougal and Garden had no wish "to dwell with sin" and thoroughly understood the meaning of penitence, self-denial and the crucifixion of the flesh.⁴⁶ Principal Sir George Adam Smith the eminent Biblical scholar has stated recently that it was a privilege and pleasure to him as a Presbyterian to record the matchless contribution made by the University of Aberdeen to religion and theology under Bishop Patrick Forbes and Bishop Patrick Scougal,⁴⁷ the father of Professor Henry Scougal, who occupied the See from 1664-1682.⁴⁸

The general standpoint of Bishop Forbes and the Aberdeen Doctors maintained itself in Scotland during the latter part of the seventeenth century chiefly through the influence of men like Robert Leighton, Lawrence Charteris and George Garden. Leighton who was translated from Dunblane to the Archbishopric of Glasgow in 1671 was by general consent the most saintly ecclesiastic of his age. He was much influenced by Archbishop Ussher of Armagh who had accepted the teaching of Doctor John Forbes whom he described

46 Henderson: ib p 14.

47 Aberdeen University Review 22 p 105.

48 Dowden: The Bishops of Scotland (Glasgow 1912) p 402.

49

as "a new Irenaeus" with enthusiasm. Like Forbes, Leighton often
 spoke of the blessings which unity would bring. In his inspired
 defence of a moderate Episcopacy he repeated in brief the argument
 advanced by Forbes and the Aberdeen Doctors: "It being agreeable
 to the Scripture and the primitive government of the church is the
 likeliest to be the way of a more universal concord" and like them
 he held that the Covenant was irregular both in matter and form and
 at law. His proposed Accommodation for reconciling Episcopalian
 and Presbyterian in the church would assuredly have found favour
 in their eyes while his conception of a Bishop not as a prelate,
 but as a co-presbyter governing in conjunction with his presbyters
 was precisely that of Bishop Patrick and Doctor John Forbes.
 Like Bishop Forbes he journeyed from parish to parish catechising

49 Garden p 16: Parr: Life of Ussher p 456.

50 Historical Papers (CUA) p 94.

51 The Works of Robert Leighton (Pearson's Edition) 2 p 646 f.

52 The main points of Leighton's Accommodation were as follows:
 That if the dissenting brethren will come to Presbyteries and
 Synods they shall not only be not obliged to renounce their
 own private opinions asent church government and swear to
 subscribe anything thereto, but shall have liberty at their
 entry to the said meetings to declare and enter on what form
 they please.
 That all church affairs shall be managed in Presbyteries or
 Synods by the free vote of Presbyters or the major part of them.
 Differences in Synods shall be taken in appeal to the
 Provincial Synod or its committee.
 The Presbytery shall try entrants. The Bishop and Presbytery
 shall ordain and admit at the church where the ordinand is to
 serve.
 cf Burnet: History of His Own Time p 198.
 53 Butler: Life of Leighton p 446. The Works of Robert Leighton
 (Pearson's Edition) 2 p 646.

teaching, supervising and like him he made the task of healing a vexed church the primary aim of his episcopate.⁵⁴ Both Bishops in their high office set before themselves an identical ideal- that of being a truly pastoral Father-in-God- both took steps to secure a diligent and efficient clergy⁵⁵ and both wholeheartedly accepted St Augustine's dictum: "Episcopatus non est artificium transigendae vitae".⁵⁶ Leighton's exposition of the Ten Commandments and his exhortation to communicants ~~owe~~ much, and are closely akin to the moral and Eucharistic teaching of Doctor John Forbes,⁵⁷ while like Bishop Forbes and the Doctors he made no divine right claim for Episcopacy and did not question the validity of Presbyterian ordination.⁵⁸

Lawrence Charteris was a most worthy successor of Leighton in the Divinity Chair at Edinburgh University where he exercised a deep influence over his students. He treated the early church Fathers in the manner and spirit of Forbes and the Aberdeen Doctors not in order to draw from them arguments for speculative or personal opinions but to learn of them the high service of the Christian ministry and to discover in them inspiring examples of heavenly-mindedness and Christian conduct. Thus Charteris was singularly free from the narrow dogmatic formalism of the Presbyterian theologians of his century and his exposition of the

59 Story: The Church of Scotland Past and Present 4 p 247-248.

54 The Works of Robert Leighton (Pearson's Edition) 1 p 29, 31 cf Chapter VII.

55 ib p 46 cf Chapter VII.

56 ib p 29 cf ib.

57 ib 2 p 462 f: 611 f: cf Chapter V.

58 Butler: op cit p 473.

difference between true and false Christianity was thoroughly in the spirit of the Aberdeen divines with whom he held the particular form of church government to be of little account in comparison with holiness and righteousness.⁵⁹

Throughout his long life- he did not die until 1733-⁶⁰ George Garden did more than any other man to continue the influence of Bishop Forbes and the Aberdeen Doctors of whose noble nature he seemed to partake.⁶¹ He was an obvious admirer of their lives and teaching as his magnificent edition of the life and works of John Forbes and eulogies on all the doctors, amply testifies. That such a truly monumental work could emanate from Aberdeen early in the eighteenth century is in itself sufficient to indicate how deep the influence of that select circle remained with the passing years. At Aberdeen the doctors indeed continued to be lovingly regarded as the great leaders of the church, as confessors for Episcopacy and theological truth and were always spoken of with veneration and not infrequently with awe. In a time of religious conflict and bitterness Garden stated his faith in terms which re-echoed the refined and reasoned sentiments of the Aberdeen school under Bishop Patrick Forbes.⁶² Like the famous Doctors, Garden protested that the true Catholicity of the

59 Story: The Church of Scotland Past and Present 4 p 241-242.

60 McMillan: The Aberdeen Doctors p 267: Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae 6 p 19, 63. D.N.B. 20 p 409-410.

61 Henderson: ib p 32-34 cf Appendix XVI.

62 The Case of The Episcopal Clergy (1704) ii p 76 cf An Apology for the Clergy of Scotland (1693) 1 p 19 cf Appendix XVI.

sacraments and the historic creeds of the church had been forgotten and like them he wished to distinguish between essentials and accidents in the Faith and to insist that everything which has a place in the church must illustrate and embrace the cardinal virtues of faith, hope and love,⁶³ while he was of a like mind with them in maintaining that schism was a matter of far more dangerous consequence to the good of the church than difference of usage.⁶⁴ His defence of Episcopacy⁶⁵ and his view of the church as the one Body of Christ the world over might well have come from the pen of Bishop Patrick Forbes himself: "It was the purpose and will of Jesus Christ that all His church should be one, not those only of one nation or under one civil government but of all nations; that it should be all as one city compactly built together, of which men were to be admitted citizens upon certain qualifications and conditions and no particular street or precinct must make the terms either of enjoying the privileges of the city or of bearing particular offices in it, narrower or other than the Master-Builder Himself made them. It was His will that all His church should be one Body, whereof He is the Head and of which there are many members and all members have not the same office; if all members were the eye where were the hearing? If all were the ear, where were the smelling?.....The unity that Jesus Christ would have in

63 Primitive Church Government in the Practice of The Reformed in Bohemia (1703) p 3.
 64 MSS Letter in Theological College, Coates Hall, Edinburgh.
 65 The Case of The Episcopal Clergy p 8-9.

His church is not that of force and constraint but the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; it is not like that of a heap of stones thrown together by force, but as lively stones built up into a spiritual house by the cement of love and charity.....but as a living Body animated with a living spirit, speaking the truth in love receiving all its influences from the Head and growing up into Him in all things.....⁶⁶ Like Bishop Forbes, Garden blamed Rome for the lamentable schism in the church because she imposed conditions which were not Christ's thereby adding to ancient belief and practice.⁶⁷ In his appeal to the Presbyterian clergy to realise that there were diversities of administration in the Old and New Testaments and in church history,⁶⁸ in his statement of the value of an imparity of ministers and in his view of the Bishop as the servant of, and not as a lord over his co-presbyters,⁶⁹ Garden is absolutely at one with Doctor John Forbes.⁷⁰

In conclusion it may be noted that the general standpoint of the Aberdeen Doctors and their Bishop maintained itself throughout the seventeenth and continued in eighteenth century not only in Scotland but also in England where William Chillingworth in his 'Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy'⁷¹ and Edward Stillingfleet in his 'Irenicum'⁷² took up an identical position. Happily the

66 ib p 5 cf Chapter lx.
 67 ib p 7-8.
 68 ib p 6-7.
 69 ib p 9-10.
 70 cf Chapter lx.
 71 Original of Bishops and Metropolitans p 24 f.
 72 Stillingfleet: Irenicum (London 1662) Preface p 396, 412, 416 etc.

influence and principles of the Aberdeen Doctors and those who nobly upheld their views still remain and are cherished amongst both Episcopalians and Presbyterians on both sides of the border. It is on that influence and on these principles that any hope of concord or better still, re-union, between these two great churches of Christendom must rest.

Chapter XI

Epitaph.

"He took care of the Temple that it should not fall...

How was he honoured in the midst of the people

in his coming out of the sanctuary !

He was as the morning star in the midst of a cloud

and as the moon at the full.

As the sun shining upon the Temple of the Most High,

and as the rainbow giving light in the bright clouds

And as the flower of roses in the spring of the year,

as lilies by the rivers of waters.....

When he put on the robe of honour he was clothed with the

perfection of glory, when he went up to the holy altar,

he made the garment of holiness honourable"

Ecclesiasticus 50 4,5,6,7,8,11.

As old age drew on Bishop Patrick Forbes continued to administer the affairs of church and state with unabated wisdom and vigour. His mind never grew feeble nor as he contemplated his latter end did his vision become dim. Old age seemed but to deepen his faith and to quicken a life-long desire to serve God. The Bishop's meditation on the sixty-third year of his age reveals him as a humble suppliant before the throne of grace and is worthy to rank with the prayers of Andrewes and Herbert, of Keble and of Ken. It is the utterance of a pilgrim ~~gould~~ and should take its place in the literature of the mystics and

the saints:

"On surer hopes my soul itself here stayeth:

I neither loathe, nor love, long here to live.

Long Biding here my blessedness delayeth,

Here under sin, I do but groan and grieve.

Heart-broken, but that firmly I believe

My death an end shall set to sin and sorrow,

Gladly come on then, grateful Guest, tomorrow.

Meanwhile my God, with Thy good Spirit direct me

So as I never wander from Thy ways:

And by Thy potent power, so protect me,

As stable I may stand, gainst all essays.

Discourage not Thy servant with delays:

But howsoev'r it shall please Thee to prove me

Still let me feel, my Lord, that Thou dost love me

Each moment teach me of my days to number

To Wisdom wholly, that mine heart applying

I never sink down in a senseless slumber:

But, lusts and all ungodliness denying;

And on Thy loving promises relying,
 In all assaults I may have hope and hearting
 And last to Thee a peaceable departing".

1. Funerals p CXV-CXVI. The full poem consisting of seven stanzas of which only 2, 3 and 4 are here printed is published in Shand's Memoir. It may be compared with the very fine verse of the poet Collins which exactly expressed the serene outlook of Bishop Patrick Forbes in his declining years.

"And when at last I must throwoff this frail covering
 Which I've worn for three-score years and ten,
 On the brink of the grave I'll not seek to keep hovering,
 Nor my thread wish to spin o'er again:
 But my face in the glass I'll serenely survey,
 And with smiles count each wrinkle and furrow;
 For this worn-out stuff which is threadbare to-day
 May become everlasting to-morrow".

Five years after he had penned these words the good Bishop received an unmistakable sign that the end was drawing on. In 1632 he was suddenly struck down with apoplexy which left him completely paralysed down the right side without however impairing his speech or his mental faculty.² Thereafter it was³ necessary for him to be carried from place to place in a chair, but he did not allow his infirmity to get the better of him and continued to preach and to preside at various meetings, until latterly he was entirely confined to bed. Although often in great pain he let no impatient word escape his lips but spoke cheerfully to all who came to him as their father and pastor, encouraging them, as far as in him lay, to fulfil their Christian witness before the world. Now that he felt his time to be short his appeals were, if anything, deeper than before. When he saw that his last hour was at length approaching the Bishop expressed the wish to receive "the health-giving viaticum of the Holy Eucharist". His son, Doctor John Forbes who received the Sacrament with him, asked whether he fully tasted the life-giving sweetness of the Bread of Life, to which the Bishop replied that he could say with Simeon: "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace according to Thy Word. For mine eyes have seen Thy salvation....." When the clergy and his family and domestics who were present implored his blessing, he laid the hand

2 cf Chapter VI.

3 J. Forbes: *Disertation de Visione Beatifica*. Preface. Funerals p LXXXV.

he could still use on the head of each one of them and as they knelt, blessed them and commended them to God in brief and fervent prayer. He was told of the supplications that were being made for his restoration to health and answered in the words of St Ambrose: "I have not so long lived among you that I am ashamed to live, nor do I fear to die, since we have a just God". On Good Friday, while they were meditating upon the Passion, his son reminded him of the prayer of Our Lord "Father into Thy Hands I commend my spirit" and remarked that Christ not only commended to the Father His own Spirit hypostatically united to His Godhead, but also the soul of every faithful dying Christian. The Bishop lifted up his eyes and said "without doubt this is the true interpretation and the very sense of the Lord's words, who prays for us and is always heard by the Father". Towards the end the dying Bishop spoke much of righteousness and peace in the Holy Spirit, of the death of the body and the immortality of the soul, of the resurrection and our heavenly inheritance, with all the joy of Christian anticipation. Then when his last moment came "he most placidly, as if in sleep, breathed out his blessed spirit, already ripe for heaven, into the hands of His Heavenly Father".

Bishop Patrick Forbes died in the Episcopal Palace of Old Aberdeen on the morning of Easter Eve, 28th March 1635 in the 71st year of his age. After lying in state for some days in

4 Garden § 17 p 6: Wodrow: op cit p 100 f: Funerals p LXXXV-XCIII: Grub 2 p 355 f.

5 Garden: ib: Spalding: op cit 1 p 39. Funerals p 3.

St Ninian's Chapel on the Castle Hill he was buried on the 9th April in the Cathedral which he had graced between the graves of Bishops Dunbar and Cunningham.⁶ The funeral was one of great pomp and solemnity. The magistrates ordered the city churches to be draped in black, at the actual time of burial that the bells should be tolled and- a tribute reserved for the distinguished - that the whole pieces of ordnance belonging to the town be discharged. The expense entailed was not grudged. It was in Keiths' phrase "in testimony of their affection and deserved respect of him".⁷

Born into a family well-connected and with a reputation for public service, and influenced in his early days by the finest teachers in the land, Patrick Forbes was scholar, saint and administrator. He was the most influential and able ecclesiastic of the first Episcopate and set a high standard for Bishops as well as for clergy and students. No one in his University or Diocese was more exact in the discharge of his duty, none more careful over his study or teaching. He was a natural gentleman of the highest personal character, devoid of vice or tyranny, peaceable, modest, kindly, faithful, pastoral, a prelate who

- 6 Spalding ib: Funerals p XCLV, 2. Wodrow has made a curious error in giving the date of the Bishop's death and burial. He states that the Bishop died the day after Pasche, April 28th 1635 and then, later goes on to say that he was buried on the 9th April following: cf Wodrow op cit p 103, 105.
- 7 The Book of Bon Accord p 220 (note).

accounted it a great sin "to offend one of the least ones that⁸ believeth in Christ".

Wodrow the radical Presbyterian who had scarcely a good word for Bishops owned that Bishop Forbes deserved his high encomiums⁹ "much more than most Scots prelates after the Reformation".

Those who knew him most intimately spoke of him as possessing¹⁰ "a variety of God's graces", as "in all things an Apostolical man",¹¹ as immovable in the face of unjust opposition, as "able to draw¹² even the most refractory spirits to the equity of truth". On the occasion of the Bishop's death Sydserf wrote to Doctor John Forbes:¹³ "Our church hath lost a father with you.....", while Archbishop Spotiswoode wrote: "Since him (Elphinstone) unto your father there arose not the like in that church; so wise, judicious, so grave and graceful a pastor, I have not known in all my time in any church. Not to speak of his learning in all sorts of Divinity, of his prudence in church government, of his solid advices in matters of state, or of the many gracious

8 Garden⁸ 17 p 6: Funerals p 141, 3: Henderson: Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland p 31, 54. The Epitaph on the Bishop's tomb read as follows: "Hic requiescit vir incomparabilis, fulgentissimum quondam Scotiae sidus, Patricius Forbesius, Episcopus Aberdoniensis, Rector prudentissimum, Pastor Fidelissimum, Praedicator eximius, Scriptor egregius, Conciliaris Regius, studii generalis Aberdoniensis Instaurator et Cancellarius et novae professionis Theologicae in eodem fundator. Baro de Oneil, Dominus a Corse. Qui placide ac pie obiit, pridie Paschatis 28 Mart Anno Dom. 1635."

9 Wodrow: op cit p 80.

10 Funerals p 73.

11 Burnet: Life of Bedell. Preface.

12 Funerals p 74.

13 ib p 226.

14

conferences I have had with him in private"¹⁴. The affection felt for the Bishop by those who knew him is shown by the number of publications dedicated to him during his Episcopate.¹⁵ At the conclusion of his Funeral sermon Baron expressed the feeling of all gathered there that day- that they would never look on their Bishop's like again- when he advised them to "Go celebrate the funerals of our venerable and most worthy Bishop: you shall never see the funerals of a worthier prelate while you live".¹⁶

There were numerous other tributes,¹⁷ some in verse, some in English and Latin prose, paid in deep and genuine sorrow by men of various schools of thought at the passing of a truly great Christian soul in whom all felt with Sibbald that "God had dwelt and wrought"¹⁸. We here note but two of these as typical of the rest. The author of 'A Dolorous Expression at the Death of The Bishop', summed up his view of the Bishop's character in the following brief but vivid verse:

"This peerless Prelate's praise in whom we saw combined
Minerva's wit, Apollo's tongue and Phineas' zealous mind,
An unrelenting hope, firm faith and daring courage,
A soul devout, a life unstained, a kindly, manly visage.
A will propense to good, a just-divided care;
A marble breast, well fortified against th' assaults of fear,
A heart enriched with love, a mind with deep conceptions,
A tongue and pen replenished with ravishing expressions.
His wit untied all knots, his courage overcame
All incident difficulties. He ever was the same".¹⁹

14 ib p 226.

18 ib p 161.

15 Anderson: Studies in The History of The University of Aberdeen p 390 f.

16 Funerals p 78.

19 ib p 12.

17 ib p 12 ff.

But no words better mirror the saintly and able Bishop than those spoken by Sibbald: "Such a depth and weight he hath of excellent virtues as maketh him also stayed and settled in everything whence he is neither moved with allurements of honour nor shaken with fear of danger, nor easily taken up with admiration. God the Rock of Ages dwelt in his soul, to whom he was most strictly united by firm confidence. Hence was he most grave and staid in all his words, deeds and behaviour. His face was as adamant when he was to strive for good against the perverse and no cross could make his heart to break (as he used to say). Popular applause he contemned.....In a word he was employed in great things and was encumbered with great crosses and yet he was still greater than his fortunes whether good or evil..... Therefore I make no doubt but that gracious God who gave him the Crown of so many excellent graces and the crown of priesthood wherein his own finger did engrave holiness, hath now given him the crown of glory²⁰".

To the eulogies of contemporaries whose privilege it was to know and to serve with the Bishop, G F Shand who made a close and accurate study of the Bishop's life unhesitatingly added his own. It was his conclusion that: "From the flagrant instances of hypocrisy, insincerity and corruption which meet us on every side in those troublous times it is an agreeable relief to turn to the contemplation of the character of a good and great man whose virtues, learning and abilities have been acknowledged with few exceptions by writers of all parties- of whose admirable

episcopal rule the impress has never been effaced from the district of the country over which he presided- and against whom it may be said that the only accusation which even the most enthusiastic writers against Episcopacy have been able to bring was that of accepting a Bishopric in the then established church of his country at the call of his Prince and of the clergy and laity of the Diocese- a distinction which the modesty and unobtrusiveness of his own character would have led him to decline".

We today, whether we be Presbyterian or Episcopalian, may justly cherish the memory of Bishop Patrick Forbes as one who adorned his high calling because he stood in the Apostolic succession of the saints which he loved to stress and which was for him the only true and fundamental succession. If Presbyterian and Episcopalian are ever to be brought together again in one national church, it will only be through the vision, teaching and spirit of men like Patrick Forbes who, while having due regard for Catholic tradition, have also charity and forbearance one towards another. And this hope which we hold dear, this ideal which sincere Christians treasure in their hearts and for which they patiently labour, is the good Bishop's truest and best epitaph for he inspired others after him to seek unity in the bond of peace that the Church of Christ might make His voice heard and make it heard effectively throughout our land.

1. William Forbes of Craigievar.

In addition to the lands of the Barony of Craigievar William Forbes had acquired the manor and lands of Menie in which Patrick Forbes was named his heir should he die without issue. In 1617 he secured ample lands in the Barony of Auchtertole in Fife and the same year he had a charter under the Great Seal erecting the extensive lands of Logie-Fintray and Forstersait with the advowsons of the churches of Fintray, Culsalmond, Kincardine O'Neil, Glentanner, Lumphanan, Cluny etc into a free barony to be called the Barony of Logie-Fintray, and also this year a charter of the lands of Finhaven and Carreston in Forfar and of various other lands in Aberdeenshire. He added Caintradlane and Beidlestone to his list of possessions in 1625.

William Forbes died in 1627 and was succeeded by his son William who was created a baronet by Charles 1 in 1630. Sir William had a notable record of public service and commanded a troop of horse in the Parliamentary service during the Civil War. The fine upright character of William Forbes the Founder of the House of Craigievar evoked the praise of Doctor Arthur Johnston the famous Latin poet of Aberdeen who composed the following verse in honour of his memory.

"Here you behold the tomb of the noble Forbes

Hear what was the character and genius of this man.

What is labour to others, it was sport

To him while he lived to seek riches.

And when he was ordered to leave his

Lands, he smiling, says, Farewell earth

Now we shall possess heaven!

What wealth he possesses and what acres of land,

Let no one wonder at - it was more that

He was master of himself".

cf

RMS VI No 1853, 2115, 2037.

ib VII No 1584.

ib No 1717 cf AP 4 p 683.

ib No 2058.

ib No 1873.

The Thanage of Fermartyn p 667. The lands of Caintradlane *have already* come into the narrative. cf Chapter 8. The New Statistical Account 12 p 1109 gives a very hazy and unreliable account of the possessions of William Forbes of Craigievar. For a complete list of all his various possessions cf The House of Forbes p 317-8 and The Thanage of Fermartyn p 666-7.

Complete Baronetage 2 p 373: Certain Records p XXXIV: The House of Forbes p 316, 321.

AP 5 p 659, 720: 6, i: p 28, 55, 90, 102, 175, 203, 562.

Funerals p XXX.

11 William Forbes, first Bishop of Edinburgh.

William Forbes was the son of Thomas Forbes of Aberdeen, a respectable burghess of the House of the Forbes of Corsindae kindred to the family of Corse, and Juliet a daughter of the eminent physician Doctor James Cargill. He entered Marischal College Aberdeen at the early age of twelve and resided for some time at several of the Continental universities and at Oxford. Previously he had taught logic at Marischal and upon returning to his native land was successively minister at Alford, Monymusk and Aberdeen. He was one of the first to obtain a doctorate from St Andrews University after the Reformation and in 1620 - McMillan is wrong in giving the date as 1618 - he became Principal of his former College. He did not occupy that post for very long but shortly left to be one of the ministers at Edinburgh, where, however, his advanced churchmanship rendered him unpopular and in 1626 he returned to minister in his native city. When King Charles visited Scotland for his coronation in 1633, Doctor Forbes preached before him and the King was so impressed that he nominated him next year for the new Bishopric which he had worked so hard to establish at his Scottish capital. Forbes did not long survive his consecration. His one work of note - a modestly expressed defence of High Church or Anglo-Catholic principles - 'Considerationes Modestae et Pacificae', was not published until twenty-four years after his death. It contains a brief and useful Memoir. Of William Forbes's great piety and learning there can be no doubt. Gordon described

him as "one of the learnedest men and one of the most eloquent preachers of this age, or that ever Aberdeen, the nursery of so many great spirits ever brought forth". Burnet eulogised him in similar vein: "He was a grave and eminent divine. My father that knew him long....and had occasion to know him well has often told me that he never saw him but he thought his heart was in heaven". Garden referred to him as a man of holy life with humility of heart and possessed of a grave and modest character, full of good works, zealous in his care of the poor and having in abundance those Christian virtues that shone forth in the best of the early fathers of the church.

cf

McMillan: The Aberdeen Doctors p 49, 263.

Wodrow: Biographical Collections p LXII-LXV: McMillan ib p 49-50, 263-4: Calderwood 7 p 516, 571-2: Irving: Scottish Writers 2 p 1 f.

Gordon: History of Scots Affairs 3 p 241.

Burnet: Life of Bedell (Preface).

Garden 41 p 19.

In addition to the Irenicum, Doctor John Forbes was responsible for the following notable works: 'Theologiae Moralis' (1632); a treatise on the Decalogue based upon Thomist Moral Theology in the Reformed Churches. It is printed in volume 1 of Garden's edition of Forbes's works. Lord Cuthrie a member of the recent Royal Commission on the law of divorce in Scotland stated that he found it impressive and useful even for modern times; 'A Peaceable Warning to the Subjects in Scotland' (1638) - the only work not printed in Garden - specially composed for a kirk rent by the autocratic introduction of a Book of Canons and a Service Book, when the historic Episcopate and observances germane to the undivided Catholic Church were being discredited as Popish; 'Instructiones Historico - Theologicae' (1645), a massive work which occupies the whole of the second volume of Garden and was composed on Protestant scholastic lines. This was the author's last and perhaps his greatest work which "if he had finished it, had been the greatest treasure of theological learning that perhaps the world has yet seen". It was John Forbes who supervised the collection and publication of those orations and pieces in honour of his father at his death under the title of The Funerals of a Right Reverend Father-in-God, Patrick Forbes of Corse, which no student of the ecclesiastical history of Aberdeen and of its great scholars of this period can afford to ignore.

Doctor John Forbes was a leading member, if not the leader of the little group of Aberdeen Doctors who strongly opposed the

Covenanters with a success of which only force deprived them when they came on a missionary errand to Aberdeen. Their chief reason for refusing the Covenant of 1638 was because it opposed the royal authority and condemned the historic Episcopate. The MS History of The Forbes Family refers to Doctor John Forbes as a confessor for loyalty and Episcopacy "whose memory is famous in the republic of letters for his profound learning and skill in Church History and the Fathers - who made one of that company of those eminent doctors and professors of Aberdeen who firmly stood their ground and continued resolute to the duty and allegiance they owed to their Prince even to the last, and most successfully managed that famous debate they had with the Presbyterian ministers who were looked upon as the ablest scholars of their persuasion and the main pillars and supporters of the Covenant to so great advantage as did not a little nettle the whole party". Indeed Doctor John Forbes was held in so high regard by many of the Covenanters themselves that it was only after several attempts had been made to convert him that he was eventually deposed. When in 1643 the Solemn League and Covenant was agreed upon between the Scots Covenanters and the English Puritan - Parliamentarians, Forbes was ordered to subscribe it on pain of banishment. His conscience prevented him from doing this and the following year he sought refuge in Holland after receiving very shabby treatment at the hands of his religious opponents. He returned to his country seat at Corse in 1646 where he spent the remaining two years of his life in learned and peaceful seclusion. The chief source of information about his

life is his 'Diary' or 'Spiritual Exercises' which gives the reader a unique insight into a deeply devout soul. It is printed in Garden and covers the years 1624-1647.

of

Aberdeen University Review Vol. 22 p 104.

Burnet: op cit: Preface,

Funerals p LXVII (n).

Gordon: History of Scots Affairs 1 p 81 f: Spalding: Memorials of The Troubles 1 p 59 f: Irving: op cit 2 p 49 f.

McMillan: The Aberdeen Doctors p 90-1: Grub 3 p 14.

The House of Corse p 316.

Spalding: op cit 1 p 105, 123, 216, 229, 232-3, 299: 2 p 39-40, 55, 95-6, 143, 161: Garden 2 97 p 70: Irving: op,cit 2 p 50 f.

Garden 3 108: Spalding: op cit 2 p 190.

Garden 3 109: Irving: op cit 2 p 50f.

Garden p 92 f.

IV The House of Corse and Craigievar

James 2nd Lord Forbes.

William 3rd Lord Forbes Duncan of Corsindae
whence Monymusk and Leslie

Patrick O'Neill and Corse
David 'Trail the Aye'

Patrick M. M. Lumsden

William M. Eliz. Strachan

Patrick of Bithnie

PATRICK William
Bp of Aberdeen Craigievar

John of Alford Robert Alexander James Arthur

Earls of Granard.

William John Robert
D.D.

George daughter
who sold Corse m.

Sir William Robert John

Laird of Kinstair

Sir John 2nd Bt. 1636-1703

Sir William 3rd Bt. Patrick of Robert Arthur Francis John Alexander Charles
1660-1709 of Foulis Learny

Sir Arthur 4th Bt. 1709-1773

Sir William 5th Bt. 1755-1816

Duncan Arthur

Sir Arthur 6th Bt
1784-1816

Sir John 7th Bt.
1785-1846

William RN

Hugh

Sir William 8th Bt.

James Ochongar and Corse

John Lord Sempill

James Ochongar 1867

William 19th Lord Sempill

Patrick David
b 1914

Anne June

V The Rise, Development, and Significance of Presbyteries.

Presbyteries developed out of the weekly Exercises of the First Book of Discipline. In 1576 the General Assembly decreed that all ministers were to resort to the place of Exercise within eight miles of their parishes. Three years later when the Provincial Synod of Lothian proposed the erection of Presbyteries, the Assembly ruled that the Exercise might be held to be a Presbytery. Though not mentioned by name in the Second Book of Discipline, Presbyteries rapidly increased in number and when in 1593 the names of all the Presbyteries were given in to the Assembly they were 48 in number spread over the length and breadth of the land and were located in the towns "whereunto the ministers of the kirks next adjacent resorted every week for exercise of prophesy". They took over the functions of the Superintendent or Bishop in their localities where, under the jurisdiction of the General Assembly, they exercised control over all churches and office-bearers. In 1597 the Assembly regulated the electoral function of Presbyteries: not more than three ministers and one layman were to be sent to the Assembly from each Presbytery as its representatives - a procedure which was adopted for the vital Glasgow Assembly of 1638, though the method of election was carefully altered to exclude those with Episcopalian sympathies. The Presbytery consisted of **preaching** and lay elders (ministers and elders) together with doctors (those who instructed in sound doctrine) from a fixed group of Kirk Sessions. Lay elders were under no obligation to attend unless the business was important and they gradually dropped out of the Presbyteries which from 1603 onwards

generally - some Presbyteries earlier than that - were exclusively composed of ministers as the representatives of the Kirk Sessions within the bounds. The Presbytery elected its own Moderator until 1606 - up to 1600 he might be a layman - who held office from one Synodal Assembly to another. In 1582 it was laid down that during the exercise of discipline the members who were not pastors and doctors were always to be fewer in number than the pastors and doctors - a law which was ruthlessly broken in 1638. In 1598 the Assembly ordained that the Presbytery meet weekly, all absentees to incur censure, and that "some common head" of religion be handled and disputed in every Presbytery publicly at the first meeting of the month - a form of procedure which was used to good effect prior to the Glasgow Assembly of 1638. After Episcopacy had been firmly established in 1610 the Presbyteries, ~~weakened in~~ authority, continued to function in the humbler mode of "the brethren of the Exercise". That the machinery remained was of vital importance to the Covenanters in the crucial period 1637-38. The development and function of Presbyteries may be gleaned from the following authorities:

BUK p 439, 497-9, 560, 567, 946-8, XLIX-LI (Appendix)

Scot: Apologetical Narration p 48, 60,

Row p 53.

McGregor: The Scottish Presbyterian Polity p 53-4, 110, 114.

Edgar: Old Church Life in Scotland I p 187 etc.

A Large Declaration p 266.

Baillie: Letters and Journals I p 106-7, 469-72 (Appendix).

V1 Election of Bishops under the Leith Formulae.

An example of the procedure under the Leith formulae is afforded by the appointment made to the vacant Bishopric of Moray in 1573-4. On 12th August 1573 the Crown granted a License to the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of the Diocese of Moray to convene and elect its nominee, George Douglas. The General Assembly appointed a day for the election which began on Sunday 20th December 1573 and continued for 3 days, the members of the Chapter hearing the nominee's doctrine and trying his conversation. The election being duly completed and notified to the King we find him on 5th February 1574 directing a letter under the Great Seal to the Archbishops of St Andrews and Glasgow, the Bishops of Dunkeld and Caithness and to the Superintendents of the kirk within the bounds of Angus and the Diocese of Dunblane or any two of them, at the humble petition of the Dean and Chapter, to consecrate Douglas as Bishop "according to the usual form past in all such cases before". The temporalities of the See were granted to the new Bishop on 23rd March 1574, by which time presumably he had been duly consecrated and had rendered the requisite homage.

cf Dowden: The Bishops of Scotland (Glasgow 1912) p 413-4.
Calderwood 3 p 297, 330-1.

The following points invite attention (1) The General Assembly fixed the day of the election (2) Although the process of election was called into doubt by the General Assembly of August 1574, there was no question of the kirk ousting, or ^{even} suspending the Crown nominee until it had reached a decision on the matter (3) The royal command for the consecration while stipulating consecration according to "the usual form" i.e. the laying ~~off~~ of hands and the Form of Admission

2/1
drawn up by the General Assembly in 1570, takes no account of the traditional Apostolic Succession at the hands of validly consecrated Bishops and indeed allows that any two Superintendents might perform the ceremony. (4) The royal Assent with order for the consecration is under the Great Seal of the realm.

cf Calderwood 3 p 340.
McMillan: Worship of The Scottish Reformed Church p 344.

Vll The Measure of conformity to the Perth Articles.

This would appear to have varied greatly from place to place. Yet on the whole those who ~~con~~formed or who showed signs of conforming were not inconsiderable either in numbers or influence. John Malcolm who had objected to Easter Communion was one who assented to the articles when they had been agreed upon at the Perth Assembly. Referring to Communion at Edinburgh in 1619 Binning wrote: "Neither man nor woman during the space of four hours offered to receive the Sacrament sitting on the forms except one base fellow". Nor did the church lack men like Doctor Michaelson, minister at Burntisland and author of the conciliatory little work 'Lawfulness of Kneeling' who introduced kneeling at communion in his church by the simple method of removing the stools. We must also reckon with the clergy, probably in a majority who re-echoed the sentiments of Gavin Young minister at Ruthwell from 1617-1671, who, when he was asked how he could adjust his conscience to the various changes which he saw tersely replied: "Wha wad quarrel wi their brose for a mote in them?". In March 1619 the Kirk Session of Perth was amongst those who agreed that communion should be received kneeling.

cf

Spottiswoode Miscellany 2 p 287, 289.

Botfield: op cit 2 p 99.

cf Leishman: Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society (1924) p 70.

Calderwood 7 p 458.

cf Story: Apostolic Ministry in The Scottish Church (1897) p 266 (quotation)

cf Spottiswoode Miscellany 2 p 289.

VIII The Significance of Conventions under James VI and Charles I.

The Scots Estates did not always meet as a Parliament. They sometimes met as a Convention. The Convention originally grew out of the General Council which was presided over by the King and owing to this fact could be summoned and dismissed at the royal pleasure and was a convenient body for giving effect to the will of the Crown since its enactments had the force of a law until Parliament met to deal with the business. Under James VI Conventions were frequently summoned to secure a taxation and the device was adopted by Charles I. In Scotland there was not as in England a Parliamentary principle to the effect that "redress of grievances must precede supply" and the need for forging such a principle lay behind the measures of Parliamentary reform which followed upon the National Covenant of 1638. Originally the King had the right to select the members of a Convention but the Convention of 1599 refused to vote a tax unless in a Convention which approximated to Parliament in numbers and personnel. Gradually James VI and Charles I lost the right to select, and Conventions began to approximate to Parliament in size and personnel - a significant development which points to the real issue under Charles I viz, Is lex rex or rex lex?

cf AP 3, 4, 5 passim: S.H.R. V's XVIII, XX containing articles by Professor R. K. Hannay: Rait: The Parliaments of Scotland.

At the Reformation the kirk claimed the teinds as its lawful patrimony and Parliament recognised that claim in 1567. But the problem of extricating the teinds and making them available for stipend was so complex that it had been shelved. Leasing went far back for the simple reason that it was the obvious way of dealing with the matter where the church was distant from the impropriating benefice. With the onset of the Reformation there was leasing on a large scale and the teinds were miscellaneously conveyed by the titulars who in most instances were the Lords of Erection. Beneath the titulars various people had acquired conflicting interests in the teinds. With the conversion of ecclesiastical holdings into lay lordships the teinds had assumed a heritable character and long tacks of teinds indefinitely renewable for cash payments were multiple and passed from father to son like any other property. This development had been taken for granted in 1617 and again in 1621 for the Commissioners of Stipend and Kirks were given a discretionary power in the granting or prolongation of leases as compensation for stipend assessments - a provision of which they were only too glad to avail themselves in their dealings with the interested laity. With the failure to achieve a general conformity to the Five Articles of Perth, James lost any interest that he had in stipend as such and in the face of strong opposition from the titulars matters were not pressed. The commissioners were content to raise the stipends of the poorer clergy to the stipulated minimum of 500 merks, though on occasion they went as high as 600

or 620 merks.

of Chapter 11.

AP 4 p 531, 605: 5 p 193-4.

Calderwood 7 p 303-4: Spottiswoode 3 p 252.

The Mar and Kellie Papers p 93.

Birnie: op.cit p 28-48.

X The Teind Policy of Charles I.

Where the teinds were paid in kind they were to be valued; where they had already been commuted for money or victual the whole rent of the land was to be valued and the fifth part deducted in perpetuity as the teind, while the heritor was at liberty to buy up his teind at nine years purchase.

The King's annuity was six out of every hundred merks of teind converted into money.

10/- for each boll of best teind wheat

8/- for the best beer

6/- for oats, meal, pease and rye

3/- where oats do not render above half meal and proportionately less where the victual is of inferior goodness.

This was to be a legal burden on all teinds except 'decimae inclusae' and those belonging to Bishops, ministers, colleges, hospitals and other pious uses.

The maximum stipend allowed by the Act of 1617 - 800 merks - now became the minimum and the generosity of the commissioners which Charles took care to encourage was not restricted to any maximum at all. With each valuation of the teinds, augmentation might be increased.

cf Forbes: Church Lands and Tithes p 338.

Connell: Tithes 1 p 403-5.

Mathieson: Politics and Religion in Scotland 1 p 350.

XI Relations Between the Bishops and the Nobility under Charles I.

The nobles were already jealous of the authority of the Bishops on the High Commission, the Privy Council and the Lords of the Articles. A letter written by Archbishop Spottiswoode to the Earl of Annandale shortly after the Perth Assembly in 1618 shows clearly that the High Commission, possessing wide powers and under episcopal control, was disliked by the lay members of the Privy Council which was charged by the King to support its sentences. The Lords of Council and Session frequently granted advocations and suspension to those in process before the ecclesiastical court and towards the end of his reign James VI found it necessary to rebuke them for slackness in dealing with religious offences, while in 1626 Charles I urged the High Commission to exercise powers so wide that in many respects it threatened to supersede the jurisdiction of the Session altogether. The Privy Council and the Session were not distinct in personnel and this defect Charles I soon proceeded to remedy, but in a manner which further increased the authority of the Bishops whose presence in the Council the nobility had resented from the first. The Seven Lords of Session who had previously sat on the Council found themselves excluded and seven others, five of them Bishops, were substituted in their stead, while Archbishop Spottiswoode was given priority over the Lord Chancellor, the traditional chairman. As early as 1612 there had been a protest against the method adopted by the King in appointing the Lords of the Articles and in 1617 the nobles strongly objected to the choice of these Lords being dictated "as the King and the Bishops would have them". These objections went unheeded and in the Parliament of 1621 the Lords of the Articles

2/8

were chosen in a similar manner. The nobles chose eight Bishops who in turn chose eight nobles and the sixteen thus chosen nominated eight lairds and eight burgesses. Unless, as was most unlikely, the Bishops failed to find eight friendly peers amongst the whole of the nobility, they could propose what measures they pleased to be simply voted 'en bloc' in Parliament, and in Parliament the Bishops were merely the instruments of the King from whom they held their office. Thus the King gained a complete control over the business of Parliament which became simply the register of the royal absolutism. In the Parliament of 1633 which ratified the land and teind measures of Charles 1 the Lords of the Articles were chosen in a manner identical with that of 1621 and the nobility subsequently entered a sharp protest against the authority of Parliamentary Bishops. After the downfall of Episcopacy in 1638, Balcanquhal was told by one of his correspondents that the Bishops were removed chiefly on account of the power they had in Parliament as a result of their part on the Lords of the Articles.

cf Botfield: op cit 2 p 769 ib 1 p 440-1.

RPC (1st series) 8 p 405.

Row p 268, 337, 341-2, 379.

Calderwood 7 p 250, 490, 621.

AP 5 p 9.

Rushworth: Historical Collections p 182.

Spalding : op cit 1 p 19.

XII Grievances Against the Teind Measures of Charles I.

There were numerous complaints that the nine years purchase was not enough and these were not without justification. In an anonymous manuscript in the Advocates' Library Edinburgh written shortly after the land and teind reforms of 1633 it was reckoned that the nine years purchase should have been eleven years purchase on account of the 2% drop in the rate of interest, imposed by the 'tua of ten' measure. The mode of securing what was a fairly liberal augmentation of stipend was a sore point with the powerful titulars. The heritor could buy no more of his teind than what remained after the augmentation had been deducted and no maximum stipend was fixed. This liability upon the teinds naturally lowered their market value and their compulsory commutation would therefore be at a correspondingly lower rate. It was argued without avail that the phrase "perpetual stipend" used in the Act of 1617 implied no augmentation revision in the future. In addition the titular had to stand the 6% deducted from his teind holding after stipend liabilities had been met for the Crown annuity, while the burghs were bound, if any extra teind accrued to them after pious objects had been supported, to pay a proportionate amount to the King. Charles claimed that he had compensated the nobles "to the uttermost farthing" but actually they were only fully compensated in the teind exchanges on the supposition, quite false, that in the past they had paid to the ministers at annex churches a full and adequate stipend. What the nobles had made on the swings of the Reformation they now stood to lose on the roundabouts of teind commutation. Not only had Charles lightened the pockets of the nobility, but

by depriving them of their authority as titulars and superiors,, they rightly conceived that he had "robbed them of the clientele of the clergy and laity". Most of the charters of erection were confirmed but so also, as a hint of what the King could do if he chose, was the Act of Revocation. Had the land and teind measures of Charles been acceptable to the majority of his subjects there would have been no need to back them with the authority of a Parliament. The large measure of resentment and apathy made Parliamentary sanction imperative. Sir James Balfour hardly exaggerated the effect of the Revocation when he called it "the groundstone of all the mischief that followed after both to this King's government and family."

cf AP 5 p 39.

Connell: Tithes 1 p 241 f: 388-9, 185, 408-9, 475, 224, 228.

A Large Declaration p 9.

Balfour: Annals 2 p 128, 164.

Burnet: History of His Own Time 1 p 31.

Example of the actual working of the Teind Measure.

Estate A in Parish B	L-	S-	D
Valuation of the Teinds	11	8	4
Deduct amount of Stipend payable out of said teinds	6	9	2 $\frac{6}{12}$
Amount of teind left to the Titular	4	19	1 $\frac{6}{12}$
Deduct 6% for the King's annuity		5	11 $\frac{6}{12}$
Teind available for sale by the Titular	4	13	2
Teind valued at £4-13-2 @ 9 years purchase	41	18	6

cf Connell: Tithes 1 p 408-9, 475.

XIII The Kirk and the Use of Vestments.

The Book of Common Order and The First Book of Discipline said nothing about the use of vestments. The question was left over for time to decide. When in England in 1565 the order was issued for the use of the surplice Moray and Maitland wrote to Elizabeth's favourite Leicester to see if it could not be annulled, while at the bidding of the assembly Knox penned a letter to the Bishops and clergy of England begging them not "to trouble the godly for such vanities....surclothes, corner-cap and tippet - the dregs of the Romish beast". In 1568 the English ambassador remarked that the Scots were not likely to return to the pre-Reformation "cornered caps and tippets with surplice and copes". In 1609 the Scots Estates passed an Act authorising the King to regulate the apparel of kirkmen and James decreed that ministers should wear the black Genevan gown in the pulpit and that Bishops should wear cassocks with black gowns *that the Genevan gown was the regular attire of the clergy of the kirk* and tippets. Evidence during divine service throughout the entire period 1560-1638 and that it continued so, is ample. In the portraits of the period ministers are invariably depicted in it. Even Doctor William Forbes whom we might have expected to don the surplice "taught in his black gown without surplice or rochet".

cf

Foreign Calendar 1564-5 No 1042.

Calderwood 2 p 353: Scot: Apologetical Narration p 19.

McMillan: Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church p 44.

AP 4 p 430-1: 435-6.

cf Rutherford: Quaint Sermons p 59, 125: Spalding: op cit 1 p 39.

W. H. Carshaw: Life and Times of William Guthrie (1900) p 86.

XIV Ordination under The First Scottish Episcopate.

In 1615 Archbishop Spottiswoode noted the lack of a uniform order of Ordination. The Form of Ordination printed in the Book of Common Order would appear to have been widely used. A paper of grievances given in by the anti-Prelatic party at the Perth Assembly stated that the ministers of the church had been ordained according to the Form inserted in the Psalm Book, as the Book of Common Order was frequently called. The Scottish Ordinal which was drawn up in 1620 in the hope of achieving a uniform service of admission to the ministry owed much to the Anglican Order and though some Scots Bishop used the Anglican Ordinal itself, neither was strictly adhered to. In any event according to the strict Catholic theory of Laud and his school the 1620 Ordinal contained two invalidating defects: (1) It made no provision for the ancient third order of Deacon. (2) It omitted words which were essential for the conferring of the priesthood. The stipulation that it was to be used "by those who have power to ordain or consecrate", may have been deliberately ambiguous and could certainly be taken to imply presbyteral ordination.

cf Calderwood 7 p 330: Wodrow Miscellany p 591-615.

Large Declaration p 20: Heylyn: Life of Laud 2 p 50 f.

Grub 2 p 361: Gordon: op cit 1 p 6.

With the death of Bishop Rose, the last surviving of the old diocesan prelates in 1720, the post-Revolution Bishops who had no specific dioceses formed themselves into an Episcopal College exercising corporate jurisdiction over the whole church with one of their number as Primus inter pares. Several of these College Bishops were chosen by local clergy to perform necessary episcopal acts in certain areas and other presbyters were elected by the clergy of a district as their Bishop. These were known as Diocesan Bishops. The College Bishops owing to a misplaced loyalty on the part of the leading Episcopalians were appointed by a body of trustees acting for the exiled Chevalier, seemed to regard themselves as representatives of both church and state and were opposed to any changes which deviated from the order that had prevailed in the old days when Bishops were truly under the Crown. Hence arose the strife over the usages. The usages originated amongst the non-jurors of England, who now untrammelled by state considerations, desired to see restored to the Eucharistic worship some of the main features of the early liturgies as contained in the Anglican Prayer Book of 1549 and in "Laud's Liturgy" of 1637. These usages were: (1) The express invocation of the Holy Spirit in the consecration of the elements. (2) The Prayer of oblation. (3) The commemoration of the faithful departed. (4) The mixed chalice. There were also minor usages to which less importance was attached such as immersion in Baptism and the chrism in Confirmation and in the anointing of the sick. The College Bishops

as partisans of the Chevalier were opposed to these usages and the Diocesan Bishops with no such loyalty to weigh with them, were in favour of them. The controversy distracted a struggling church for some twenty five years.

cf Mitchell: A Short History of The Church in Scotland (1911)
p 100-101.

Walker: op cit p 10-15: Farquhar: op cit p 3.

MSS letters of George Garden in The Theological College,
Coates Hall, Edinburgh.

XVI Doctor George Garden - His Character and Faith.

George Garden was obviously a man whose character was forged in the heroic mould of Bishop Patrick Forbes and The Aberdeen Doctors. He was a leader, dignified, cultured, of strong will and great determination, and at the same time loveable, deeply religious, entirely humble and with the heart of a little child. So Henderson describes him- a description very similar to that applied by Garden himself to Doctor John Forbes. Persecution and religious conflict drove Garden into mysticism.¹

Garden's summary of his faith was as follows: "That God created man for this end that he might love Him and enjoy Him for ever; that man destroyed himself and in God only is his help found; that God takes no pleasure in the death of a sinner but rather that he repent and live; that He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance; that He so loved the world that He sent His Only Begotten Son that whosoever believes in Him might not perish but have everlasting life; that He sent not His Son to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved; that the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost; that when he shall say to the righteous that he shall surely live, that if he trust to his own righteousness and commit iniquity all his righteousness shall not be remembered, but for his iniquity he shall die; if he turn from his sins and do that which

1 cf Henderson: Mystics of The North East p 21, 32.

is lawful and right, none of his sins shall be remembered to him, he shall surely live; that all our good comes from God and all our evil from ourselves.²

2 cf The Case of The Episcopal Clergy (1704) ii p 76 etc:
An Apology for The Clergy of Scotland (1693) p 19 etc.

Bibliography.

Primary Material.

Acts of The Parliaments of Scotland Volumes 1-6. Edinburgh
1816 A P.

Acts and Proceedings of The General Assemblies. Bannatyne
Club 1839-45 B U K.

A Large Declaration concerning the Late Tumults in Scotland
from their first originalls. London 1639.

Antiquities of Aberdeen and Banff. Spalding Club 1843.

Burnet. G. The Life of William Bedell. (Preface only).
London 1685.

History of His Own Time. London 1725.

Elakhal. G. A Brieffe Narration. Spalding Club 1844.

Botfield. Original Letters Relating to the Ecclesiastical
Affairs of Scotland in the reign of James VI.

Bannatyne Club 1851.

Baillie. R. Letters and Journals (Volumes 1 and 2).

Bannatyne Club 1841.

Balfour. Sir James. Annals of Scotland (Volumes 1 and 2)
Edinburgh 1824.

Calderwood. D. History of the Kirk of Scotland (Volumes 2-7).
Wodrow Society 1845 Altare Damascenum ceu
Politia Ecclesiae Anglicae-obtrusa... Ecclesiae
Scoticae etc Edinburgh 1708.

Certaine Records Touching the Estate of the Kirk. Wodrow
Society 1846

Calvin. Institutes (Books 2 and 4)

Consultations of The Ministers of Edinburgh (2 Volumes).

Scottish Historical Society 1921 and 1930
Evidence Taken and Received by the Commissioners for visiting
the Universities of Scotland. (Volumes 3 and 4). London 1837.

Funerals of a Right Reverend Father-in-God, Patrick Forbes of
Corse with a Biographical Memoir by G.F. Shand. Spottiswoode
Society 1845.

Fasti Aberdonenses Spalding Club 1854

Forbes. Dr John. Irenicum Amatoribus Veritatis et Pacis in
Ecclesia Scotiana. Aberdeen 1629
Irenicum. Amsterdam Edition 1646

Disputationes Theologicae Duae. 1620

Forbes. Bishop Patrick. A Defence of The Lawful Calling of The
Ministers of the Reformed Churches.

Middelburg 1614

A Learned Commentarie. Middelburg 1614

Letter To A Romish Recusant. Middelburg
1614.

A Short Discovery of Their Divers
Deceits. Middelburg 1614.

Eubulus - A Dialogue. Aberdeen 1627.

First Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts.
London 1874.

Garden. G. R. V. Johannis Forbesii a Corse Opera Omnia.

Amsterdam 1703.

The Case of The Episcopal Clergy 1704.

An Apology for The Clergy of Scotland 1693.

Gillespie. G. Dispute Against the English-Popish Ceremonies
obtruded upon the Church of Scotland. 1637

Gordon. J. History of Scots Affairs (3 Volumes). Spalding
Club 1849

Guthry. H. Memoirs of Henry Guthry, Late Bishop of Dunkeld.
2nd Edition Glasgow 1748.

Hailes. Memorials and Letters relating to the History of
Britain in the Reign of James I. Glasgow 1766.
Memorials and Letters relating to the History of
Britain in the Reign of Charles I. Glasgow 1766.

Heylyn. The History of the Life and Death of William, Lord
Archbishop of Canterbury London 1671.

Hooker. Ecclesiastical Polity (Volume 7) Keble's Edition.

Inquisitionum ad Capellam Domini Regis Retornatarum (Volume 1)
1811

Knox. The Works of John Knox (6 Volumes) edited Laing.
Edinburgh 1864.

Keith. R. An Historical Catalogue of Scottish Bishops.
Edinburgh 1824.

- 290
- Laud. Works of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury. Oxford 1853.
- Lindsay. True Narrative of the Proceedings in the Perth
Assembly. London 1621.
- Leighton. Robert. Works Pearson's Edition.
- Melville. James. Autobiography and Diary. Wodrow Society 1842.
- Munimenta Almae Universitatis Glasguensis. Maitland Club 1854.
- Miscellany of The Spalding Club. (Volume 2). Aberdeen 1842.
- Miscellany of The Wodrow Society. Wodrow Society 1844.
- Menzies, Roma Mendax or the Falsehood of Rome. London 1675.
- Original of Bishops and Metropolitans by James, Bishop of Armagh 1704
(This work includes Garden's: The Case of The Episcopal Clergy)
- Opuscula Posthuma Lanceloti Andrews. Oxonii 1852.
- Peterkin. A. Records of The Kirk of Scotland. Edinburgh 1838.
- Prynne. A Breviate of the Life of William Laud. London 1644.
- Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum R M S
- Rotuli Scaccarii Regum Scotorum. Edited Burnet Exchequer Rolls
- Register of The Privy Council. 1st and 2nd series. Edinburgh
1877 seq. R P C
- Records of Old Aberdeen. (Volume 2). New Spalding Club 1899.
- Row. J. Historie of The Kirk of Scotland. Wodrow Society 1842.
- Rushworth. J. Historical Collections (Volumes 1 and 2) London 1680
- Rutherford. S. The Due Right of Presbyteries. London 1644
- Scot. W. Apologetical Narration of the State and Government of the
Kirk of Scotland since the Reformation. Wodrow Society 1846
- Spottiswoode. J. History of The Church of Scotland. Spottiswoode
Society 1851

- 291
- Spalding. J. The History of The Troubles and Memorable
Transactions in Scotland and England. Bannatyne
Club 1828-29
- Selections from The Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen. Spalding
Club 1839
- Strachan. Andrew. Panegyricus Inauguralis. Aberdeen 1631
- Scougal. Henry. Works. Glasgow 1765
- Valuation Roll of The County of Aberdeen for 1667. Third Spalding
Club 1933
- Wodrow. Biographical Collections. Edited Lippe. New Spalding
Club 1890

Secondary Material.

- Aberdeen University Review (Volumes 20-1, 22).
- Aiton. J. The Life and Times of Alexander Henderson. Edinburgh
1836
- Anderson. P. J. Officers and Graduates of King's College.
New Spalding Club 1893
- Records of Marischal College. New Spalding Club
1889
- Studies in the History and Development of The
University of Aberdeen. Aberdeen 1906
- Book of The Old Edinburgh Club (Volume 13). Chapter 1. Edinburgh 1924
- Book of Bon Accord. Aberdeen 1839

- Bicknell. The Thirty-Nine Articles. 1926.
- Birnie. A. A Short History of The Scottish Teinds.
Chambers Edinburgh
- Connel. Sir J. Treatise of the Law of Scotland respecting Tithes
and Stipends of the parochial clergy. Edinburgh 1815
- Cowan. W. A Bibliography of The Book of Common Order and Psalm
Book of The Church of Scotland 1556-1664. Edinburgh 1913
- Cormack. A. A. Teinds and Agriculture. Oxford University Press
1930
- Dowden. J. The Bishops of Scotland. Glasgow 1912
- Edmond. J. P. The Aberdeen Printers. Aberdeen 1886
- Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae (Volume 6). Edinburgh 1926
- Fisher. G. P. History of Christian Doctrine. Edinburgh 1916
- Forbes. William. Church Lands and Tithes. Edinburgh 1705
- Grub. G. Ecclesiastical History of Scotland (Volumes 2 and 3)
Edinburgh 1861.
- Gibson. The Thirty-Nine Articles. London 1898
- History of The University of Edinburgh 1883-1933. Chapter 1.
The Foundation of the College of Edinburgh by Professor R. K.
Hannay. Edinburgh 1933
- Historical Papers submitted to The Christian Unity Association of
Scotland 1911-1913. Constable 1914.

Huchieson. A History of The High School of Stirling.

Stirling 1904.

Harrison. A. W. The Beginnings of Arminianism to the Synod
of Dort. London University Press 1926

Henderson. G. D. Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland
Cambridge 1937

Mystics of The North-East. Third Spalding
Club 1934

Hunter. A. M. The Teaching of Calvin. Glasgow 1920

Irving. D. Lives of Scottish Writers (Volume 2) Edinburgh 1851.

Johnston. A. Geneological Account of the Family of Johnston of
that Ilk. Edinburgh 1832

Kennedy. Annals of Aberdeen (Volumes 1 and 2) London 1818

Lumsden. Geneology of the Family of Forbes with a continuation.

Lawson. J. P. History of The Episcopal Church in Scotland from
The Reformation to the Revolution. Edinburgh 1844

History of The Scottish Episcopal Church since the Revolution.
Edinburgh 1843.

MacFarlane. Geneological Collections (Volume 2). Edinburgh 1900

McMillan. D. The Aberdeen Doctors London 1909

McMillan. W. The Worship of The Scottish Reformed Church 1550-1638
London 1931

- Mathieson. W. L. Politics and Religion in Scotland 1550-1695
(Volume 1) Edinburgh 1902
- McCrie. T. The Life of Andrew Melville. Edinburgh 1819
- McGregor. Janet. The Scottish Presbyterian Polity Edinburgh 1926
- Morgan. A. The Rise and Progress of Scottish Education London 1927
- McLean. D. The Counter-Reformation in Scotland London 1931
- McCulloch. W. E. Vires Illustres Universitatum Abredonensium
Aberdeen 1923
- Paul. J. Balfour. The Scots Peerage. Edinburgh 1914
- Pannier. Calvin et l'Episcopat 1926
- Rashdall. H. The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages (Volume 2)
Oxford 1936
- Rait. R. S. The Parliaments of Scotland. Glasgow 1924
The Universities of Aberdeen. Aberdeen 1895
- Stuart and Paul. Scottish Family History. Edinburgh 1930
- Selwyn. E. G. The First Book of The Irenicum. Cambridge 1923
- Sprott. G. W. Scottish Liturgies of The Reign of James VI.
Edinburgh 1871
- Scottish Notes and Queries (Volumes XI-XII 3rd series). May 1934
- The House of Forbes. Third Spalding Club 1937
- The Thanage of Fermartyn Aberdeen 1894
- The New Statistical Account of Scotland (Volume 12) Edinburgh 1845
- Votiva Tabella: The Memorial Volume of St Andrews University.
St Andrews 1911.

Irish Ecclesiastical Journal.

March 1849

London Quarterly Review.

January 1929

Maitland Club Miscellany (Volume 3) Edinburgh 1842-3

Malcolm. The Minutes of The Justices of The Peace for
Lanarkshire. Scottish Historical Society 1931.

Napier. M. Memorials of Montrose and His Time (Volume 1)

Maitland Club 1848-1850

Prothero. Statutes and Constitutional Documents 1558-1625.

Oxford 1913

Quick. Synodicon in Gallia Reformata. London 1692

Rutherford. S. The Divine Right of Church Government and

Excommunication. London 1646.

Letters. Bonar's Edition 1894

Stillingfleet. Irenicum. London 1662.

Strype. The Life of Archbishop Grindal

Select Biographies. Wodrow Society 1845-1846

Selections from the Records of the Presbytery of Lanark.

Abbotsford Club. Edinburgh 1839

Selections from the Minutes of The Synod of Fife (Volume 1).

Abbotsford Club Edinburgh 1837

Spottiswoode Miscellany (Volumes 1 and 2)

Story. R. H. The Apostolic Ministry in the Scottish Church

Edinburgh 1897

The Church of Scotland Past and Present. Edinburgh 1894

The Church of Scotland. Edinburgh 1894

Stephen. T. The Life and Times of Archbishop Sharpe. London 1839.

The Mar and Kellie Papers.

True and Impartial Account of the Most Reverend Father-in-God,

Doctor James Sharpe.

(1723)

The Answers of Some Brethren of the Ministrie to the Replies 1638

Wodrow. A History of The Sufferings of The Church of Scotland

(Volume 1) Glasgow 1828-1830

Welch. J. Popery Anatomised 1672 edition

Walker. W. Memoirs of Bishops Jolly and Gleig. Edinburgh 1878.